

AP The
London Quarterly
&
Holborn Review

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN
JUL 16 1953

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

LITERATURE · HISTORY · SOCIOLOGY
RELIGION · THEOLOGY · PHILOSOPHY
EDITOR · LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., PH.D.

Contributors Include

E. L. ALLEN, PH.D., D.D.

A. G. CURNOW

TOM DRING

C. W. M. GELL, B.A.

T. FRANCIS GLASSON, M.A., D.D.

ROBERT HAMILTON

J. A. LAINÉ, M.A.

ATKINSON LEE, M.A.

E. GORDON RUPP, M.A., B.D.

C. RYDER SMITH, B.A., D.D.

London

THE EPWORTH PRESS

(FRANK H. CUMBERS)

25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1

JULY 1953

PRICE FOUR SHILLINGS NET

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW
 is published on 25th March, June, September and December. All contributions (typewritten, if possible) should be sent to the Editor, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope.

Contents

Editorial Comments: by Leslie F. Church, B.A., PH.D.	161	The Challenge of Nietzsche by E. L. Allen, PH.D., D.D.	206
Some Reflections on the Origin and Development of the English Methodist Tradition, 1738-1898 by E. Gordon Rupp, M.A., B.D.	166	The Mount of Olives by J. A. Lainé, M.A.	211
Robertson of Brighton: A Centenary Tribute by A. G. Curnow	175	A Philosophy of Healing by C. W. M. Gell, B.A.	215
Berdyáev by Atkinson Lee, M.A.	180	The Essential Tennyson by Robert Hamilton	220
The Family of God Today by Tom Dring	184	Recent Literature by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., B.D.	224
Commodore Perry (July 1853) and the Awakening of Japan by T. Francis Glasson, M.A., D.D.	198	From My New Shelf by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.	235
		Our Contributors	239

Make Coronation Year

a happy memory for the children

The crowning of a Queen is a memorable event. In years to come the young folk of today will recall the wonderful happenings of 1953. But to the girls and boys who entered the National Children's Home, the year will be indelibly fixed in their minds for other and, to them, more vital reasons. It will be remembered because it marked the end of sadness and suffering, and the beginning of new and better things. You can share in the joy of bringing this happy transformation about. Celebrate Coronation Year by sending a special gift today.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME

CHIEF OFFICES:

HIGHBURY PARK, LONDON, N.5

T
r
a
o
v
'T
P
p
t
P
o
Z
t
n
f

a
o
t
c
v
p
h
V
g

I
t
v
v

s
l
o

i
o
g
l

a
i
n
s

Editorial Comments

THE CONTEMPLATIVE MAN'S RECREATION

THIS year marks the tercentenary of *The Compleat Angler* or, as it was further described, *The Contemplative Man's Recreation*. Few other English classics are so sure of immortality. The name of Izaak Walton is as widely known as most of our great authors, yet his literary work is contained in two comparatively slender volumes. The one is a collection of five miniature biographies, and this book of 'Lives' was a favourite with the critical Dr Johnson; the other has been called 'the piscatorial classic'. There had been other books on fishing long before old Izaak produced his masterpiece. In 1486 Dame Juliana Berners wrote a *Treatise Pertaining to Hawking, Hunting and Fishing with an Angle*, but it became a 'museum piece' centuries ago. There have been innumerable books since, but though many of them might help the fisherman more, they are soon out-dated and forgotten. In *The Compleat Angler* there are qualities which defy old Father Time, and ensure the book a place on a shelf that is near the owner's most restful chair. Not even the new invader Television will banish Piscator and his friends. There are strong reasons for this strangely gentle supremacy.

For one thing this is the first nature-book in English literature. Far from being a compendium of fishing technicalities it is a naïve but whole-hearted expression of the Englishman's love of the countryside. As Charles Lamb said: 'It breathes the very spirit of innocence, purity and simplicity of heart.' It is not the record of a chaw-bacon, wandering aimlessly by some quiet stream. The author has his eyes wide open and there is no dullness in the words that tell us what he sees. He is no pedantic or superior person airing his knowledge to his 'ignorant' readers. Nor is he ever the bore who catalogues and classifies but does not enthuse or wonder. Where he walks he discovers the footprints of God and finds time for quiet thanksgiving.

In this age of speed and constant tension, Izaak Walton is a healthy corrective. In what George Sampson calls his 'exquisite book' the fisherman is more important than the fishing or the fish. The astonishing fact is that 'the Father of Angling' writing about his special subject has captured the hearts of thousands of readers who never held a rod, nor knew the thrill of landing a trout.

It seems, at first, incredible that so obscure and ordinary a man, using such slight material, could create so fine a work. Even more strange is the fact that this little shop-keeper, living a quiet, uneventful life, should win the affection of so catholic a company of readers through three centuries.

At first he was apprenticed to an ironmonger and later had a linen-draper's shop in Cornhill. Moving to Fleet Street, at the corner of Chancery Lane, he was described in the lease as a sempster. He retired at fifty and lived till he was ninety, gathering a host of friends about him through the years. Neither rich nor indolent, he was beloved for the qualities that one might best call Christian.

His first wife, who died in child-birth, was the great-grand-niece of Cranmer, and his second, Ann Ken, was the half-sister of Bishop Ken. Many of his most intimate friends were clergymen and it was not surprising that his daughter should marry a Prebendary of Winchester, and one of his sons become a Canon of Salisbury.

There is no plot in *The Compleat Angler* but only a slender framework within which the progress of a walk by the little rivers of Hertfordshire is pictured. The three friends—Piscator the fisherman, Venator the hunter, and Auceps the bird-catcher—talk brightly, and their walk does not become mere idle sauntering.

Here and there an anecdote or apothegm lights up their vigorous conversation. There is the story of the preacher who preached 'to procure the approbation of a parish'. Borrowing a sermon from a neighbour who had preached it with great acceptance, he was astonished that it was 'utterly disliked'. Complaining to the man who lent it to him he was thus answered: 'I lent you, indeed, my fiddle, but not my fiddle-stick; for you are to know everyone cannot make music with my words, which are fitted for my own mouth.' So old Izaak reproved the fisherman who complained that he couldn't catch fish because he hadn't got his friend's rod and tackle.

In another mood he says, though still quite gently: 'There are too many meddlers in physic and divinity that bring destruction to their followers.'

There is humour and good fellowship as they walk and talk, but every now and again the nature-lover reveals himself as something of a mystic. 'Under that broad beech-tree yonder I sat down when I was last a-fishing, and the birds in the adjoining grove seemed to have a friendly contention with the echo that lives in a hollow near the brow of that primrose-hill. . . . And as I sat these thoughts possessed my soul that I thought, as the poet hath it,

*I was for that time lifted above the earth,
And possess'd joys not promised at my birth.'*

Then, suddenly—as though he must keep his feet firmly on the ground—he says: 'But let's further on, and we will try for a trout. 'Tis now past five of the clock.'

The book has been styled a classic of contemplation. Its author has succeeded in transmitting something of his cheerful piety to each succeeding generation. To walk with him from Ware to Walton is to be rested in mind and spirit, and to share his contentment in simple things.

'And when I would beget content,' says Venator, 'I will walk the meadows by some gliding stream, and then contemplate the lilies, that take no care. That is my purpose; and so "let the blessing of St Peter's Master be with mine".' To which benediction Piscator adds his own. 'And upon all that are lovers of virtue, and be quiet, and go a-angling: Study to be quiet.'

This is a friendly book which has recreated faith and hope and love in men's spirits these three hundred years. As one reads it one feels as Austin Dobson felt, when walking in the Cotswolds, near Bibury:

*And he who goes a-wandering there,
Methinks his blood doth quicker beat.*

A POEM TO THE QUEEN—By WALTER DE LA MARE

THE accession and crowning of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second have been a symbol of that continuity which is England and of what Walter de la Mare has called its Englishness. For a moment or so the brilliant pageantry and the solemn ceremony marked an occasion, but before it began and after it was all over,

there was and is an England. Enshrined, not only in its hills and dales or its villages and towns but in the hearts of its people through the centuries is the spirit we cannot define but can, at least, transmit to our children's children.

In the year of Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee Walter de la Mare wrote a poem to Her Majesty the Queen. For the crowning of her great-great-granddaughter he has given us the poem again, with but three words altered. We who call Elizabeth our Queen think of our England as did our fathers when they paid homage to Victoria long ago.

By the courtesy of the poet who has done so much to interpret a profound and precious tradition we are able to reprint this enduring poem.

*Elizabeth is my queen,
England is my land,
Oh! may God let her people be
Countless as sand!*

*Through all the passing hours
The never silent sea
Upon her hollow-sounding shores
Shouts Liberty.*

*Old Drake my cousin is,
And Shakespeare's Elizabeth,
And Nelson—he whose fame
Shall outstay Death.*

*Ah! When with eager eye
I scan the centuries
And count this England's matchless men
My blood doth rise.*

*And burns upon my cheek,
And welters in my heart,
Urging me in their foot-tracks go
And do my part.*

*Sweet are her fields to me,
Sweet is her lovesome rose,
Sweet with the savour of the seas
Each wind that blows.*

*Elizabeth is my queen,
England is my land,
Oh! may God let her people be
Countless as sand.¹*

TWICE EXILED: DISPLACED PERSONS AND DISEASE

THE general problem of the future of 'displaced persons' is still a major issue in the post-war world. The special case of people affected by tuberculosis is

¹ Reprinted from the June issue of the British edition of *The Reader's Digest* by courtesy of the author. World copyright 1953 by the Reader's Digest Association Limited.

particularly tragic. They are twice exiled—by their nationality and by their physical condition.

In the American zone there are at present approximately a thousand tubercular displaced persons undergoing treatment in the Sanatorium at Gauting. About half that number in the British zone are distributed in sixty-one hospitals. The necessary isolation of people already depressed because they are aliens in a strange land, creates a psychological outlook which retards proper medical treatment even when that is available.

In some of the smaller hospitals there is sometimes only one patient who is a displaced person—a condition which makes him as solitary as a leper in a hostile medieval village. His depression deepens. He feels he is unwanted, and often becomes bitter in his hopelessness. In such conditions the Welfare Workers are doing good work against tremendous odds. Their visits do a great deal to restore confidence in people whose loneliness is almost unbearable.

In the case of married people the tension is still further increased. Whilst the rest of the family struggles to live bravely in a Displaced Person's Camp, often far distant from the hospital, the patient frets at what seems to him like imprisonment, for an indefinite term. Many marriages have come to grief because communication has been difficult, and the strain of separation has continued, like the treatment, over a period of years. Some families have left Germany or Austria and found asylum in Canada or New Zealand. The anguish of leaving a loved one behind, in weakness and uncertainty, has been for some the final tragedy. In some cases the patient, with invincible chivalry, has insisted on their going in spite of their protests. Unfortunately it has meant, sometimes, that he has then resigned himself to what seemed pitiless fate.

The tubercular displaced person knows a boredom that the normal patient in a sanatorium escapes. Books and reading matter, in his own language, are often unprocurable and in many hospitals there is no provision made for occupational therapy.

When the cure is sufficiently successful the patient is discharged. This brings him to another most urgent crisis. If he is fortunate enough to receive a food parcel just then, the period of transition is a little easier. Discharge from hospital often means admission into a camp, where conditions are Spartan. Just when he needs all reasonable amenities, he may find himself in a barely furnished room, with quite inadequate bed-linen, and the most primitive, out-door sanitation. The heating arrangements, in some places, are deplorable. Hardship and cold would try the toughest, but for a tubercular person just discharged from a sanatorium, they become tragic. The result, not infrequently, is that he finds himself back in hospital.

In some areas, such as Frankfort, the situation is not so bad. The convalescent is able to live in some privacy, though often on the barest subsistence rations. If he is able to work, and fortunate enough to secure it, his hope is rekindled and he begins to improve. Where, however, there is an unemployment problem amongst the Germans themselves, the chance of the tubercular displaced person is small and, failing to secure work, his case again becomes desperate.

Recently the number of refugees coming from the Eastern zone has made the problem even more complicated. Accommodation has had to be found for the new population, and houses of any kind are scarce.

Attempts are being made in some areas to gather the discharged patients in one centre, which means that supervision and visitation is much more possible. Being visited regularly they cease to be 'cases' and become people, slowly regaining their self-respect. Where the displaced person is in a minority of one, it is almost inevitable that his morale weakens and, at the very time when progress is beginning, he slumps in a new despair.

Taking the short view there are certain things which would help to alleviate the immediate suffering. The provision of adequate bed-linen or the material from which it could be made, and an arrangement by which discharged patients could receive regular food parcels suitable for the first stages of convalescence would improve the chances of physical recovery. The need, however, goes deeper. It is essential that every effort be made to restore the displaced person to his proper place in society. To do this is difficult enough in the case of a normal healthy man or woman. We are assured by those working in Germany and Austria that for the tubercular displaced person it is impossible unless it is considered on an international level. The Germans, themselves, cannot effect the restoration. Meanwhile these afflicted people, finding the disease has made them still less of an economic asset and still more of a physical liability, are in despair.

It is obvious that the founding of a settlement, like our own Papworth, in Canada or Rhodesia, or even in some other part of Europe would help immensely in the solution of the problem.

Some suitable place for convalescence—preferably in Switzerland—might save many lives. Two months in care-free, health-giving surroundings could work wonders.

In the cases where families have been separated, the remedy lies in the amending of the immigration laws, which are so hard on the physically unfit. Only on conditions carefully guarded by medical science and Christian charity could such particular exceptions be made, but we believe that the salvaging of this human wreckage is the bounden duty of civilized peoples. Considering the relatively small numbers involved and the possibility of adequate precautions being taken, there is no insuperable obstacle.

Many of these people have survived the horrors of the concentration camps, only to find themselves forgotten, passed by or despised. We believe that the situation is not realized by the general public nor by the majority of Christian people.

It is because of this ignorance that we stress the need for more adequate information. The problem is not insoluble, once the public conscience is stirred.

(We are, indeed, grateful to those who have sent to us some account of the conditions they are facing. In the event of our readers desiring to help directly, we suggest that they might write to Miss Muriel Gofton, Wesley House, Hannover, Landschaft 3, B.Z. Germany. Either she or other Welfare Workers, under the direction of the World Council of Churches, Service to Refugees, would be able to give information as to the best means of sending help.)

LESLIE F. CHURCH

Articles

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE ENGLISH METHODIST TRADITION, 1738-1898*

TO ANSWER the question, 'What must we do?'—how shall the Church live and proclaim its Gospel in a revolutionary age—we may consider two preliminary questions. First, 'What were we?'—where did we come in, what were the questions posed by Church History to which Methodism responded in the creative moment of its origin, and which have given the Methodist people a character and temper as recognizable and, if you will, as pegged down at an historical date, as the Order of St Benedict, the Franciscans, the Quakers, and the Salvation Army? But a second question is not less important: 'What have we become?'—how have the changes and chances of a century and a half modified the structure and the mood of the Methodist Church? When that century and a half is such an epoch as that between 1789 and 1950 we should expect to find new questions, new answers, new direction of Christian energies in an ever-widening context, so that today the problems to which any Church must address itself are beyond the compass of any single denominational theology or ethic and demand an ecumenical mind and an ecumenical conscience.

In our time, perhaps in every time there is a gap and a time-lag between the discussions of the theologians, and the theology of the laity, even the teaching and preaching, the thinking and reading laity. Things are indeed improving. Canon Smyth said recently: 'The Bible has reasserted its discipline over the theologians and the preacher. . . . We have witnessed the disappearance not only of the venerable clergyman of my youth who quoted Browning, and of his up-to-date successor whose preaching consisted mainly of moral pep-talks on current problems, but also the old-fashioned type of secondary-school headmaster whose religion appeared to be a curious amalgam of Keats, a *Shropshire Lad*, *Songs of Praise*, and *The Passing of the Third Floor Back*.' But just now, when fundamentalism is on the increase in schools and universities, it is important that the teaching laity should know of the positive assessment of the doctrine of the Kingdom of God, and of the apostolic preaching which is a notable feature of recent ecumenical and biblical theology. Does that sound even faintly patronizing? Let me hasten to more respectful comment. It is a feature of our time, curiously paralleled in that late second century when the Church had also to meet an intellectual crisis, to have produced Christian laymen better able to get theology across to educated lay audiences than the parsons, in part because trained in mental disciplines which lie closer to the operative intellectual currents of our time: so T. S. Eliot, Charles Williams, D. L. Sayers, C. S. Lewis, to come no nearer home. Perhaps our professional theologians must now take a modest role. The papers they will prepare toward our Oxford Conference may resemble the patient ferreting of the Scotland Yard detective: he will put the facts together, arrange the evidence, sort out the clues, is allowed by courtesy his own clumsy guesses at the solution—but if he knows his place he will be content to play Inspector Parker to Professor Herbert Butterfield's Lord

* A paper read at a conference of Methodist University teachers at Southlands in 1950.

Peter Wimsey, Dr Watson to Professor Willey's Sherlock Holmes, and Captain Hastings to Professor Jessop's Hercule Poirot! More seriously, this cutting edge which the academic Christian layman derives from his mental discipline seems to me important. It is one of the grave unresolved tensions of our post-Reformation world that two great coherent traditions have lost their inner connexion with Christianity: a tradition of truth, in letters, science and philosophy, a tradition of social justice in the political philosophies, the ideologies and operative idealism of modern revolutionary man. A Church which cannot face these with discriminating and yet with reconciling wisdom has, it seems to me, no hope of speaking with power to the coming Age.

The moment of origin of great movements is always revealing. It is as though the Church tied a knot in its handkerchief and said: 'Here is something I must never forget.' The sociological context is also important. Dr Wearmouth has shown how the radical movements of the early nineteenth century copied the structure and polity of Methodism, with their political class-leaders, class-meetings, class-money, and their camp-meetings, synods, and conferences. This suggests that, just as the very polity and temper of the Dominicans and Franciscan movements responded to the new bustling life of the thirteenth-century towns, so there was that in Methodism which responded to the social stresses and changes of the age, and that as in the Reformation in the sixteenth century and the Puritan movement in the seventeenth century, so in the Evangelical Revival a new social class was becoming religiously and politically articulate and competent. We must never forget that until the 1830s the Church of England was far nearer to the middle Ages than to our modern world, and that in her structure the old frustrating abuses lingered which, on the Continent, had been swept away by the Counter Reformation. There persisted too, traditions of asceticism and devotion which join the Puritans with their Laudian opponents, and account in part for seventeenth-century scholasticism and the pre-occupation of Puritan, Anglican, and Jesuit, with problems of conscience, with casuistry.

It is through the mind of John Wesley that the Methodist Revival was coupled with the historic Church, and it is of importance that into that mind were woven the richest and most diverse strands of the English Protestant tradition. On the one side stood Non-conformity, with its background in Puritan theology and piety, and the Calvinist ethical legacy. On the other, the great Caroline divines with their moral, spiritual, and ascetic theology rooted in patristic study and stretching out toward the rich liturgical traditions of the Eastern Church, and who contributed to the theological and liturgical concern of the Non-Jurors, and so to an influence on Wesley the extent of which has not yet been fully explored. In the mid seventeenth century, theology split, as so often, into mysticism and rationalism, in the Cambridge Platonists and the Scottish mystics, and the Latitudinarian divines. Wesley's *Christian Library*, his common sense, his tolerance, his views on Church polity attest his debt to these, and their effect upon the development of Methodism. But all these diverse elements, though they could provide tinder and steel, could not strike fire. To them must be added those from the Continental Reformation, the Lutherans, the Moravians, the Pietists. Wesley was debtor to them all: could even add to them a motley collection of French and Spanish catholics—Pascal and Molinos and M. de Renty, with no false eclecticism and nothing of the dilettante. Obviously the mainspring of the Revival is not to be found in such a theological

catalogue. But given the fact of his conversion, this theological pattern of 'inward religion' was important. It provided a frame of theology and devotion for the Preachers and the people.

'Our doctrines', as he called them, have a coherent shape which bears the technical name 'Evangelical Arminianism'. If we would understand it, we need not regard the intricate dog-fights over seventeenth-century Holland or the dreary succession of Anglican Arminians, nor even the debates between Wesley and Fletcher and the Calvinists, but we may turn to the hymns of Charles Wesley and their exultant and reiterated: 'For all, for all my Saviour died: for all my Lord was crucified.'

For perhaps this was the most startling theological change in the eighteenth century. In the course of centuries the view had extended that the Divine Plan of Salvation was not intended for the whole of mankind. Catholic and Protestant preachers in the seventeenth century vied in more and more extreme statements of the view that, on the contrary, the saved would be a tiny handful snatched from the mass of doomed and damned mankind. The Evangelical Revival did not make all the difference. The new secular optimism of nature, the doctrines of natural law and the rights of man must be taken into account. But from the Revival came a new optimism of Grace. The optimism of Grace was bound with a pessimism of nature in its fallen state: it upheld the classic view of the gravity of Sin revealed in the Cross: it affirmed the solidarity of mankind in rebellion against God, the entire depravity from which no individual, class, race, nation or century can 'contract out'. But this was the reverse side of its doctrine of Total Grace: the affirmation, Justification by Faith, that sinners by Divine mercy, are invested with the whole righteousness of God, the emphasis that the new life of the Christian man as a child of God rests in no human emotion or experience, but on the operation of the Holy Spirit of God: and, in the doctrine of Perfect Love, the promise that there is no limit, apart from that inherent in bodily existence in a fallen world, to what God can do for men here and now. This optimism of Grace brought a moral transformation of whole communities which has hardly a parallel in the history of mankind. It inspired not only the Revival in the eighteenth century, but the missionary enterprise of the nineteenth. Note the close of the *Instructions to Methodist Missionaries* which we owe to Jabez Bunting and which is an apostolic document even greater than the famous *Liverpool Minutes*, which in 1820 brought Conference to its knees. 'We unite in tens of thousands in fervent prayer to God for you. May he open to you a great door and effectual, and make you immediately or remotely the instrument of the salvation of myriads.' 'Our Doctrines'—'Our Hymns'—'Our Literature'—'Our Discipline': this was a four-fold framework of theology, devotion, and morality, on which innumerable souls could grow, and for lack of which modern Methodism is in sorry condition.

There was a real danger at the death of John Wesley that the work of the Revival might disintegrate, that it might dissolve Methodism into a series of competing factions. John Wesley had done his best to guard against this: he had given them a polity which saved them from the fate of Whitefield's 'ropes of sand'. He had made the Conference of the Preachers the connexion between the Methodist preachers and the Methodist people. But he had postponed a whole series of problems, and despite his own loyalty to the Church of England had been as Dr Beaumont said 'like a rower who faces in one direction, but moves in the opposite direction with

every step he takes'. The Methodists were moving with the time into the grim, coarse world of the Industrial Revolution: they were involved in the political and social repercussions of the French Revolution and the costly Napoleonic wars. It is no accident that the crises within Methodism are almost contemporaneous with the peak years of social upheavals in Europe, in 1791, 1828, 1848, and parallel with similar divisions and dissensions among the Methodist Churches in North America.

There was nothing doctrinaire about the polity of Methodism and in an age of written contracts, rights, and constitutions, Methodism had room to develop and to grow. 'Methodism,' cried one of the preachers in the great debate on ordination in 1836, 'piece by piece, as it was wanted, came down from heaven from God.' Perhaps this was a little exuberant, but Methodism, like Topsy, just 'grewed' from a collection of Societies into 'the Body' as it was called, a Church with its own ordinance of Word and Sacraments. There were those who would have seen Methodism adopt an episcopal system, but not from any High Church notions. If Thomas Coke could press Wesley, successfully, to make him a Bishop in 1784, he could also, in 1808, write to the Prime Minister and to William Wilberforce offering to leave Methodism if he could be consecrated as an Anglican Bishop and let loose to organize a Christian Church in India. Conference behaved after Wesley's death with wisdom and moderation. If they turned their face against the attempt of Alexander Kilham to produce a Methodism after the legalistic pattern of radical Dissent, they could also snub the famous Lichfield committee of 1794 with its formidable ex-presidents, when they suggested a list to Conference of names to be appointed Bishops, a list which by singular coincidence included their own names! It was important that Conference refused to make any distinction between the preachers. It was important that they related the Methodist preachers to an even greater brotherhood, the Methodist people. The sense of Christian solidarity and mutual responsibility has never been more finely or simply put than in the most beautiful of all our Pastoral Addresses—that from the Conference of 1793: 'O brethren, we hate putting away, especially those who are members of the mystical body of Christ, and our dearly beloved brethren. . . . We cannot, we will not part with any of our dear flock, who love God and man, on account of unessential points. For we love you all, and are the servants of all for Jesus's sake.' You will have noted the phrase 'the mystical body' which these Methodists took from their liturgy, fifty years before the Anglican Church recovered its meaning.

As the heroic age of persecution ceased, Methodism moved into the age of Chapelicity; the Methodists experienced the perquisites of godliness; the success due to sobriety, thrift, and industry; and moved into more and more prosperous levels of the social pattern. At Grantham the Methodists burst into song about their new Chapel:

*Magnificent indeed it is,
And stately it doth stand.
It stands in Finkin Street,
The centre of the town,
The philosophic Institute
Is rather lower down.*

But the new buildings needed pew rents to maintain them, and they became the symptom of a growing rigidity which was hardening the limbs and perhaps the

heart of what had been the most flexible instrument of evangelism in the history of the Church.

The horizons of early nineteenth-century Methodist culture were narrowing. We remember how John Pawson destroyed Wesley's abridgement of Shakespeare, how Richard Brackenbury cut out of the pages of his edition of Cowper the story of 'John Gilpin' as 'not tending to edification'. Even the splendid genius of Adam Clarke with his love for Shakespeare and the *Arabian Nights*, his mastery of fifteen languages, his expert knowledge of anatomy and chemistry, mineralogy and history, so that if we wanted a name for this assembly we might call ourselves the Adam Clarke society—even he had his inhibitions and tabus which included not only Church music, dancing, tea and coffee, but also roast pork.

But to this period belong heroic achievements also. There was the opening of the Second Front, the Mission Field. The despatches which all missionaries had to send home—'with no high colouring of the facts' they were told, provided an inspiring challenge to the Methodist people. The response of Methodism and the eagerness of the new Mission House brought a series of financial strains which led to the rapid development of a connexional administration. Allied with this was the initiative of Methodism in regard to slavery. Here was an evil which came home to Methodism in its evangelical work and witness. The stench of those floating Belsens, the slave ships, could be caught for miles at sea and was known to our sailors and our missionaries while the conditions among the slaves were the direct concern of our West Indian missions. When the anti-slavery fight was at its height, one of the two missionary secretaries, Jabez Bunting, risked his career in Methodism to join an anti-slavery committee. The other, Richard Watson, made the most daring of all nineteenth-century political interventions, by calling on the Methodists at Leeds in 1831 to vote for Thomas Babington Macaulay on the ground that he was an uncompromising opponent of slavery.

Alas, what Watson did not mention was that the other candidate at Leeds was Thomas Michael Sadleir, the proponent of the Ten-hours Bill against the domestic slavery of children in the English factories and mines. It raises the problem, modern enough, of why Christian 'blind spots' lie so close to insights. It is the fact that these horrors were no more known to Methodist people than the horrors of Buchenwald and Dachau were known to good German Methodists in 1944. If that sounds incredible we have the witness of the great Tory Radical—Richard Oastler—who lived for ten years in a growing manufacturing district, within sight of the factories, and had joined in the fight against slavery without any knowledge of what was going on at his very door.

The Methodist body lay curiously athwart the middle-class life of England at a time when there was no political instrument which could give it expression (as perhaps there is a new middle-class today which similarly corresponds to no political label and is courted by both extremes—as were the Methodists). The Methodists tended to concentrate on the private character of an M.P. or on some particular moral issue. So in the 1950 election a Catholic religious community simply sent one question to the local candidates and voted *en bloc* on the attitude of the candidates to Catholic schools. The temptation to Methodism was subtle at a time when there was no Christian social and political conscience. It is difficult to distinguish Satan when he comes as an angel of light. It is even more difficult to distinguish the Angel of Light when he is disguised as Satan. To pick out a

Christian element from a non-Christian, even anti-Christian, anti-clerical ideology, to hear the Christian call to compassion and intervention in the cause of justice when it comes from the midst of a coherent view of life which flouts cherished Christian truths, that is the rub, not only in 1830, but in 1950. Perhaps it was the tragedy of Methodism that it produced in Jabez Bunting a great statesman when above all things it most needed a prophet. Well, we are all ex-Prims at this point in our story, and can rejoice together in the evangelical fervour, the rugged simplicity, the honest stubbornness of those who made their prayers deep in the Durham mines, or who stood bare-headed under the trees in Sherwood Forest to sing Wesley's translation, 'Lo, God is here, let us adore and own how dreadful is this place'—a startling reminder of the connexion between liturgy and justice.

This is not the place to examine the intricate background to the disputes and divisions which rent Methodism in 1828, 1836, and 1849, and which resulted a hundred years ago in the 'Methodist Bay of Biscay'—the landslide in membership which cost the Wesleys 100,000 members in a few years. Ignoring the element of original sin, and not very original cussedness on both sides, there is one truth and one defect of that truth, which belonged, it may be, to each side. In the first place the Methodist preachers and their Conference represented the link between Methodism and the historic tradition of the Church as it had been focused in John Wesley. 'The Living Wesley', said Bunting, 'is the brethren in full Connexion.' Wesley had chosen his preachers, and called them into Connexion with himself. There was an element within Methodism which from the beginning had not depended on popular vote or election. 'This is the real apostolic succession,' said one of the Preachers in 1836, 'the ministry appoint the ministry.' At a time when the Conference was much more representative of the small body of preachers, it maintained its right to exercise discipline over those who had, of their own free will, accepted it. In 1849 when the whole Dissenting Press was howling at them, when *The Times* added its thundering protest against this college of cardinals which flouted principles of British justice and fair trial, it was Samuel Waddy (no yes-man where Conference was concerned) who wrote a letter to *The Times* which they refused to publish—'You forget we are a religious . . . and not a secular society. . . . We guard against those terms and usages which would assimilate us to the House of Commons, or any other secular assembly. . . . We profess to be held together, not by the laws of an intricate or elaborate code, but by the simple bonds of an unsuspecting brotherhood.' Though the practical needs of the mission field, where missionaries needed official status, were responsible for the reintroduction of ordination by laying-on of hands in 1818, it was natural that, in 1836 it should supplement the reception into full connexion by the standing vote of Conference. But remember what men these were who strove to uphold the pastoral office. They were not all Adam Clarkes or Richard Watsons or Robert Newtons. We may find one clue to the ascendancy of Jabez Bunting in Winston Churchill's famous remark about William Temple: 'He was the only sixpenny thing in a Penny Bazaar.' Somebody once said to me about these men, 'They were only a lot of glorified lay agents after all'—and I wondered if he knew how near that remark comes to the vilest sneer of the anonymous 'Fly Sheets'—the scornful list of the vulgar trades from which the preachers came, 'ordinary tradesmen' who dared to call themselves a 'venerable assembly'—and how curiously similar it is to the list of callings from which came many of the great Bishops and Popes of the tradesmen martyr Churches

of the second century, and I wondered if, after all, a 'glorified lay agent' might not be a reasonable working definition of the apostolic ministry? But I think it helps us to understand how these men had the defect of their own loyalties, and came to exercise a clericalism the more truculent and unbending by reason of its inferiority sense.

On the other side there was the affirmation of an element in apostolic Christianity which had been overlaid for many centuries, the dignity and calling of the laity, returning, as has been suggested, as an angel of light amid the ranks of Satan, against the background of a feared and detested radical and revolutionary ideology. And yet there was a defect in this virtue, too. Mr Urwin closes his courageous study of the 'Significance of 1849': 'Pray God that Methodism may so interpret its Gospel, that it may bring it nearer the People, for whom Christ died.' But here lies the real fallacy of the Christian Radical tradition, mistranslation—and it is fatal—which renders the word *Laos*, by *Demos*. And perhaps we all need to ponder the biblical use of the word in which *Laos* stands for the whole People of God, where there is room neither for clericalism or anti-clericalism, because Christ is all, and in all. With the Oxford Movement, that revolutionary movement breaking with the historic past in the name of historic tradition, there comes a change in the relation of Methodism to the Church of England, the beginning of that approximation of all later Victorian Nonconformity. Thomas Jackson's pamphlet of 1834 on the relation of Methodism to the Church breathes the warm affection and gratitude of one steeped in the great Anglican divines of three centuries. James Rigg's *Churchmanship of John Wesley* (1878) shows the effect of the vehement attacks on Methodism by Dr Pusey and his friends, and the development of a new evangelical Nonconformity. At the end of the 50s there began the Revival of religion in America which spread to England and found a climax in the 70s in the work of Moody. A recent book, *The Second Great Awakening*, regards it as of almost equal influence with the Evangelical Revival, and though it is doubtful if any author has so manhandled statistics since the Anglo Saxon Chronicle, the effect of it was great and there are parts of modern Methodism where it strongly persists.

The old, self-contained Methodist world was opening up, bringing new tensions between the generations. The first Methodist Ecumenical Conference, in 1881, was constrained to devote a day to 'Possible Perils of Methodism', in which speaker after speaker deplored the recent introduction into Church life of 'recitations, songs, dialogues, and dramatic representations, more or less sensuous and trifling in their nature'. 'I have felt sick at heart', complained the Rev. C. M. Giffin, 'in seeing children exhibited on a platform . . . elated by plaudits . . . the acting and not any virtue being the occasion of praise.' The same speaker affirmed that the aspect of acting was 'more toward the animal than the intellectual or spiritual'. 'The true reputation of Shakespeare', he affirmed, 'is that of an author, not an actor: his worth belongs to the study, rather than to the stage.'

But now the Churches had to meet a series of intellectual cyclones converging from many directions: the new theories of geology and biology; the development of archaeology and comparative religion. There was a new edge upon old rationalist attacks on the doctrines of Eternal Punishment and Atonement, the beginning of assault upon the miracles of the Bible and of radical criticism of the biblical documents themselves. There were few Christians who could face these assaults with equanimity. Many took the attitude of the old ladies who prayed: 'Lord,

grant that this evolution be not true, but if it is, give us grace to hush it up.' That was rather the line of Methodist Conference under the influence of Dr Osborne, for when in 1880 Dr Dallinger, F.R.S., proposed to lecture on 'The Creator and what we may know of Creation', it was deferred as inexpedient, and it was not until 1887 that the Methodist people could hear that 'the gulf between man and the noblest ape is such as to be practically without comparison'. Too often the orthodox replies puzzled the simple believers. They recall the argument about fairy stories in Kenneth Grahame's *Golden Age*: "'Do you mean to say it's all lies?'" asked Charlotte bluntly. Miss Smedley deprecated the use of any such unlady-like words.

"These stories had their origins, my dear, in a mistaken anthropomorphism in the interpretation of nature. But though we are now too well informed to fall into similar errors, there are still many beautiful lessons to be learned from these myths . . ." "But how can you learn anything", persisted Charlotte, "from what doesn't exist?" Others resembled the Red Indians who replied to Sergeant Lamb of the Ninth when he tried to explain what a map was to them: 'We dare say, brother, that you yourself believe this to be true, but it appears to us so improbable that to assent to it would confuse our mind with respect to other related subjects.'

One school of theology alone seemed capable of meeting these attacks, of absorbing their implications without abandoning classical Christian tradition. This was the theology of Frederick Denison Maurice, a theology of the solidarity of the whole Church in Jesus Christ, of the whole race of mankind in Him, and the coherence in Him of the whole creation, and so the integrity of all truth, all knowledge. He laid the foundations for a reorientation of the traditional doctrine of human nature, of atonement, of eternal life and eternal punishment. James Rigg was the outstanding statesman of the middle period of nineteenth-century Methodism but his most massive intellectual achievement was an all-out assault on the theology of Maurice and his friends which he published in 1857 as *Modern Anglican Theology*: 'Let Christians beware', he cried, 'of this new and complex heresy which is little better than a modern Gnosticism of a refined character', and he pressed the attack through five hundred pages of citation and argument. He does sometimes strike home. But he also shows the limitations of the new Nonconformist Orthodoxy. Another famous Methodist, W. L. Watkinson, was to speak in 1881, almost in terms of the Papal encyclical of 1854 of the peril of 'anything like an attempt to recast our theology with the view of bringing it more into harmony with modern thought'. But Rigg's book shows how deficient that theology had become. Justification by Faith so lucidly expounded by Jabez Bunting on classical lines had now disintegrated into a scholastic doctrine of atonement, and an emotional crisis of conversion. Against Coleridge and Plato, against Clement and Irenaeus and Origen, against Tauler and Luther, so well known to Julius Hare and Kingsley and Maurice, James Rigg can only oppose the rigid Protestant orthodoxies of the last fifty years, the great names of Magee and Dr Pye Smith. Rigg stood for an older world. Two young rebels thought otherwise of Maurice. One of them, Scott Lidgett, refused even to read Rigg's diatribe. He found that in Maurice which echoed the hymns of Wesley, the optimism of Grace of the Revival, a doctrine of Catholicity, of wholeness, of concern for the mind and body as well as the soul of man. When, along these lines, he prepared his Fernley lecture on *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement* in 1897 a charge of heresy was brought against him while the book was

in the Press, and the President scanning the proof sheets had to tell him that the book did not take sufficient account of the Divine Justice.

The other debtor to Maurice was Hugh Price Hughes. The new concern for social evils in great cities which is a feature of the 80s and which is paralleled in the work of the great 'Innere Mission' in Germany found a champion in Hugh Price Hughes with his combination of celtic and semitic fervour and his sympathy with every desperate cause. He became the initiator of a Forward movement, the embodiment in action of the Nonconformist Conscience. The climax was his pivotal speech which resolved the Parnell crisis, with its tremendous peroration (borrowed, like many of his epigrams, but none the less effective): 'We stand immovable on this eternal rock: what is politically wrong can never be politically right.' He had the defect of his great virtues: impetuosity, a hardness with opponents in contrast to his own hyper-sensitivity, and his writing in the *Methodist Times* sometimes submerged the prophet in the journalist. He was, like Kingsley, singularly sensitive to the undercurrents of the time. He shared the last liberal illusions of the fallacy of the common man. In his copy of Lidgett's lecture he writes in the margin, against a condemnation of the ecclesiastics and theologians for their share in the Cross, a vehement 'Yes, yes!'—but against the guilt of the common people of Jerusalem an indignant 'No!' He sometimes backed the wrong cause: anti-vaccination, the Imperial Idea, while his sermon in praise of the Prussian Emperor reads curiously today. But his passion for righteousness, his impatience with sectarianism and his hostility to wooden clericalism was prophetic and he did more than anybody to change the mood and direction of Methodism toward the coming age.

That champion of Lidgett and Hughes in their troubles, the splendid scholar Wilfred Moulton showed that Methodism could acclaim the biblical scholarship of Westcott, Hort and Lightfoot without capitulating to a narrow fundamentalism on the one hand or an unevangelical negative modernism on the other. We owe much to these three great men and their friends. They entered into that intellectual travail without which the Church cannot hope to reconcile those lost traditions of truth and social justice. Dr R. W. Dale warned Evangelical Christians that 'the process of reconstructing our theological systems will have to be gone through again', and that this would entail active and drastic intellectual and spiritual renovation as that of the sixteenth century. 'If we refuse to recognize this, we shall soon be unable to render any great service to our own generation: we shall be unable to render any service at all to the next.'

Today we are better placed to correct the real defects in the theology of Maurice. The rediscovery of the theology of the great Reformers at a stage before their molten, glowing insights had petrified into varying orthodoxies, our better knowledge of patristic and medieval theology provide the needful antidote to Platonic and Alexandrian mystic intellectualism, though they have done as much to sharpen as to soften the problem of conversing with humanism. At least there can be no retreat to denominational solutions of these problems. In theology, as in the Church, in Dr Scott Lidgett's words 'the days of the old stark denominationalism are over'.

Yet one listens to the Ecumenical conversation with sureness that the Methodist contribution must not go by default as, by and large, it seemed to do at Amsterdam. We heard there, on one side, the old optimism of nature, the humanist evaluation

of man, nature and history tricked out under a Christian veneer worn desperately thin. We heard on the other side the pessimism of Grace, the stern call to the remnant to be faithful in the Church 'under the Cross'. Only the Jesuits who were not there, and the Methodists might have spoken of that optimism of Grace, of hope for the whole mankind, of the power of faith to the casting-down of strongholds of the salvation of myriads, of the mending of the Churches and the healing of the nations by the Catholic spirit, the royal way of love.

Such is the travail of mind we owe the past and future. If we accept the responsibility involved in the gifts and opportunities with which we have been endowed, above the common privilege, to teach and train and lead the coming generation of Christians, it calls us to apprehend the intellectual challenge of our time, and to witness in that estate in which it has pleased Almighty God to call us, to the all-embracing truth of the eternal Gospel.

E. GORDON RUPP

ROBERTSON OF BRIGHTON: A CENTENARY TRIBUTE

ON 15th AUGUST 1853, the brief but vital career of Frederick William Robertson came to its earthly close. A week later a remarkable procession made up of representatives of all sections of society—'Agnostics, Jews, Unitarians, Roman Catholics, Quakers, Dissenters and Churchmen,' according to a contemporary report—wound its way to the Brighton Extra Mural Cemetery where, in a hollow of the downs he loved so well, his body lies. He was only thirty-seven when kindly death laid its quiet hand on his tortured frame, and few could have guessed what a potent influence that short life was to have on English theological thought.

For the remainder of the nineteenth century Robertson counted for more in the life of the Churches than almost any other single individual. His name did not become so familiar to the masses as those of some others of the Victorian divines, and his sermons never attained the enormous circulation of Spurgeon's. But in his powerful sway over ministers of all denominations—he was often called 'the preachers' preacher'—no one had a greater share in moulding the religious life of this country. And at the present time, a hundred years after his death (and a century is more than sufficient to play havoc with most reputations) it is safe to say that his place in history is assured. He belongs to the number of those who, leaving this stage of existence in the morning of their years, win the crown of immortal youth.

The present writer's acquaintance with the personality of Robertson is typical of that of many. First of all, and in impressionable years, the introduction to his sermons, which had an honoured place on paternal shelves. Then, in college days, the gradual purchase of the whole five precious volumes, which were read and re-read until they became part of the very stuff of being. Later came his other books: *Corinthians*, *Genesis*, *Lectures and Addresses*, and, of course, Stopford Brookes's admirable biography. The heroes of our youth are apt to become superseded in after-years, but the passage of time has not dethroned Robertson from the high place he occupied in early reverence. In this connexion, and as an off-set

to a personal allusion which ought to have been prefaced by an apology, Bishop Hensley Henson may be quoted. In his *Retrospect* he refers to 'Robertson of Brighton, Newman, and Dean Church' as 'the only volumes of sermons which have gone with me through my preaching career'.

The reverent affection Robertson inspired in following generations is illustrated by a reminiscence preserved by Mr Coulson Kernahan in his *Celebrities*. He tells how he introduced Charles Boyd Robertson, the only surviving son of the great preacher, to Ian Maclaren at a dinner of the Authors' Club. 'Robertson is not an uncommon name, and Ian Maclaren had no inkling who the newcomer was, until a chance allusion to "one of my father's sermons" caused Ian Maclaren to give a sudden and startled gasp, and to lay his hand on the other's coat-sleeve, exclaiming as if he could not believe his own ears: "You are not the son of the great Frederick Robertson of Brighton?" "I am," was the reply. For a moment Ian Maclaren was almost overcome. "Mr Robertson," he said, "what it means to me to meet one who has in his veins the blood of one of the noblest of men, one of the greatest preachers that ever lived, and to whom I owe what I owe to your father, I find it difficult to say." There were tears in his eyes as he spoke, seeing which I turned away, and left the two to talk together.'

What is the secret of this reverential regard for Robertson, and of his great influence on so many diverse minds? First of all, his teaching is marked by a wide tolerance and a ringing sincerity. Dr John Kelman tells us that when Robert Louis Stevenson discovered the 'broadminded and manly sermons of Robertson of Brighton,' he 'could not find words to express his appreciation'. Broadminded and manly: the adjectives are well chosen, and they suggest one reason for the attractiveness of Robertson's message—the association of an all-embracing charity with a fearless straightforwardness. Brought up in a narrow and rigid school, when Robertson 'found himself' after the days of his Cheltenham ministry he shook off his early trammels and escaped into a large place. He came to see that the spirit of Christianity is an infinite spirit, and is capable of infinite expression. Henceforth he rejoiced in the exceeding breadth of the commandment of God, and drew no false distinction between sacred and secular. The salvation he offered his hearers—and here the fearless sincerity of his message is perhaps most clearly seen—was a salvation from sin and not from hell, from the things that were hateful to God and not from those disliked or dreaded by man. It was this note of reality that so attracted men to his ministry, working men in particular, and gave him such a sway over them. It is probably true to say that Robertson's influence on working men was not exceeded by that of any clergymen of his day, not even with the exception of Kingsley or Maurice.

A second feature is the positive note of his teaching. He aimed at building up rather than pulling down. He was, indeed, accused of being ruthlessly destructive—there were few things of which he was not accused during his six strenuous years in Brighton—but when the dust of controversy had cleared it became evident that his constant aim was the establishment of truth rather than the overthrow of error. Through all his teaching one can trace his rooted belief in the principle of Shakespeare's lines:

*There is some soul of goodness in things evil,
Would men observingly distil it out.*

That was Robertson's emphasis. He believed there was an essential truth at the heart of every form of error to which the human mind gives credence, and set himself to 'distil it out', to discover and express it.

Again, his method was suggestive rather than systematic. With all his loyalty to reason, he believed that spiritual truth is spiritually discerned rather than intellectually grasped. He was a poet rather than a logician. In his teaching there was no attempt at the construction of what Macaulay sarcastically described as 'a system of philosophy with principles coherent, independent, subordinate and derivative'; and in his carelessness of superficial consistency he would have won the admiration of Emerson himself. There is little attempt at definition in his sermons, for, like the celebrated Frenchman who said that '*Le Dieu défini est le Dieu fini*', he felt that to define is to limit. In a book not unknown to Methodist preachers of a former generation, the late Dr Banks's *Manual of Christian Doctrine*—a grim volume, and the focus of many fears—there is a naïve remark concerning Robertson's position regarding the Atonement: 'F. W. Robertson's views on this subject are important because of the influence of his name. But it is not easy to define them.' It certainly is not easy to define them, and one can sympathize with the anxious systematic theologian in his endeavour to induce Robertson to enter one of his neatly-labelled categories. It is like trying to express the shape of a flower in terms of one of the six systems of crystallography. Robertson did not subscribe to any system or school, and does not lend himself to scheme or plan. In his infinite variety and suggestiveness he is at one with all the greatest teachers of the ages, and certainly with Him whom both Robertson and Dr Banks would regard as Master.

Once more, he was a progressive. While he paid homage to the past, and learned from it, the whole bent of his mind was to the future. The extent to which he was in advance of his age may be gauged from the fact that he opposed the then almost universally accepted dogma of the verbal inspiration of the Bible, and its inerrancy and infallibility on all points. He was plentifully endowed with that fearlessness of the fate of truth in the world which is of the essence of faith. He had none of the nervous apprehension for the safety of the ark of God which, surely, is the sign-manual of unbelief. He held that truth is its own best protector, and had no need of being shored up by adventitious supports. He had no distrust of critical enquiry, and did not believe in suppressing doubt. A preacher of our own day, in reply to the plea that truth should be 'conserved', well remarked that 'you do not conserve the acorn; you plant it and let it grow'. Robertson might have said that. Hilary of Poitiers in far-off times had a controversy with those who manifested what he called 'irreligious solicitude for God'. There was the same controversy in Robertson's time, and he was the nineteenth-century Hilary.

But while he was a progressive thinker, and in the best sense of the word an intellectual, there was at the same time a fervour and a glow in his teaching which made it supremely moving. And the fire is still there, after a hundred years, in the printed page. His sermons have no trace of the arid and pedantic coldness which makes the writings of some advanced thinkers so dreary, and so unsatisfying. They are marked by spiritual warmth and soul-stirring enthusiasm. When preached, they proved as attractive and helpful to the unlettered as they were to the maturer mind. In this connexion one remembers that the servant-girls of his congregation gave him a Christmas gift of a Bible for his lectern—a token of

appreciation which touched him deeply. It is no small indication of his greatness that, while the learned of his day (and still more of following days) heard him gladly, he attached to himself those at the opposite end of the intellectual scale.

But Robertson's main characteristic has yet to be mentioned. The dominant feature of his message, the chief secret of his influence, was his personal devotion to Jesus Christ. During his lifetime he was accused of being anything but orthodox in his beliefs concerning the Founder of Christianity, but no one can read his books without being convinced that his whole life was centred in Christ—the human Christ, the divine Christ, the historical Christ, the living Christ. In his day the Saviour of the world had become very largely a mere doctrinal abstraction. He was immured behind a dead wall of credal definition. Robertson brought his generation face to face with the living Jesus who taught and worked in Galilee. 'Under his teaching and spirit', says a contemporary who survived him for many years, 'the very face of preaching was changed in half the pulpits of our land. The winter of dreary tradition and wooden doctrine passed, and the spring of fresh, living, winsome religious thinking arrived.' He insisted that the historical realization of the person and work of Christ is necessarily connected with the realization of Christ as a fact of present experience. 'He held', says his biographer, 'that with the loss of the reality of the incarnation, the childhood, the temptation, the daily life, the miracles, the death and the resurrection of Christ, we should lose Christianity,' and he preached those facts as the foundation of spiritual life. Robertson does not belong to the number of those who would sublimate Christianity into a vague ethos, a congeries of beautiful ideals, without historical basis. If much of his emphasis seems to be on the human side of the character of Christ, it was because this aspect of His personality had been obscured in current thought, and because (like Luther) he was convinced that a belief in the human character of Christ must precede an assurance of His divine origin. But the Christ in whom Robertson believed was no mere super-mortal. He had for him the values of God, as we should put it today. He bowed the knees of his soul before Him, and accorded Him the worship of his whole being. Not since St Paul's day has there been one who could say with more utter truth than Robertson: 'To me to live is Christ.'

These are some of the main features of Robertson's message, but this paper makes no pretence to present an adequate analysis of his teaching. Robertson defies analysis, for he was essentially a prophet, and in a prophet there is always something baffling and inexplicable. 'The prophet', writes Dr John Watson, 'interprets intellectual movements to a generation, he starts a new trend of thought, he recasts the past and saves its heritage for the future. He is more than a teacher, he is a revealer; he is more than a leader, he is an inspiration; and in the Church of Christ no Englishman of his century more entirely fulfilled the idea of a prophet than Frederick Robertson.'

Like all prophets, he was stoned. Few men have suffered more. He was harassed by unceasing slander and abuse during the closing years of his life. He was accused of scepticism, of rationalism, of infidelity, of socialism, and of much else that was (or was meant to be) opprobrious. And so sensitive was his nature that many a charge which a more normally constituted man would have brushed aside as negligible, he felt to the point of agony. His biography faithfully portrays his sufferings, and, with all its charm, is a poignant book. But shining through the dark clouds of suffering we see the essential brightness of his knightly character,

and we are not surprised to learn from his son that he had 'a delightful sense of fun', and that 'no one loved better to play an innocent trick'.

Such was Frederick William Robertson—real, earnest, sensitive, courageous, chivalrous, saintly; the champion of every cause he believed to be right, however unpopular it might be; living intensely, suffering greatly, dying heroically; and bequeathing to posterity the high example of a noble, selfless devotion to the Kingdom of Truth.

What of the future? There are signs that Robertson's influence as a theological teacher has been on the wane since the turn of the century. No new edition of his sermons has been published since the three volumes issued in the Everyman Library over forty years ago. But the decline in his influence probably means (or one would fain think so) that the principles for which he stood have become generally accepted, and are now axioms in the thought of the day. However this may be, we may be confident that as an inspiring personal force he has a permanent place in the life of the world. In particular, he will always have a special attraction for those who are passing through what Dr Dale called 'the sunless gulfs of doubt'. In his pages those who are puzzled in their religious thinking will see a soul like their own, often bewildered and baffled, and yet holding on firmly to the great moral certainties. They will see in him a notable illustration of the law that loyalty to the light already possessed is the path to fuller light. 'Be honest with yourselves,' said Froude to the students of St Andrews; 'say nothing to others that you do not think, and play no tricks with your own mind.' The words might serve almost as a portrait of Robertson. They certainly indicate one secret of his attractiveness to inquiring minds.

Dr Inge, in one of his *Outspoken Essays*, has a reference to Robertson's great contemporary, Cardinal Newman: 'We can imagine nothing more calculated to drive a young and ingenuous mind into flippant scepticism than a course of Newman's sermons.' That is certainly outspoken, not to say severe, but it is essentially just. Newman's sermons will always be read for their melodious English; but with their vagueness, their subtlety, their constant suggestion of *arrière pensée*, their merciless dissection of human motive and their equally merciless judgements of human frailty, they are not likely to lead the honest doubter into the way everlasting. Robertson's sermons are as unlike Newman's in every other respect as in literary finish. Their utter honesty, their complete sincerity, and their resolute flinging open of every window in the house of Truth, make them supremely helpful to those who are beset with difficulties in matters of faith.

Stopford Brooke, in the introduction to his biography, refers to those who since Robertson's death 'have learned to reverence him as their Teacher, who have found in his sermons a living source of Impulse, a practical direction of thought, a key to many of the problems of Theology, and, above all, a path to Spiritual Freedom'. Their number has vastly increased since those words were penned; and will, we may be sure, receive constant if not numerous accessions for many a long year to come.

A. G. CURNOW

BERDYÁEV

I—THE PHILOSOPHER

THE RESULTS of the second World War have demonstrated not only the political importance of Russia, but also the significance of Slav, and especially of Russian, thought. No longer can it be said, as it was by Carlyle, that Russia had yet to speak her message; her voice now resounds throughout the world. And its tones are singularly like those of Carlyle himself. The Russian has not only learned to obey, as he said; he has also come to prophesy. Amongst the Russian seers, Nicolai Alexandrovich Berdyáev (born 1874, near Kiev) holds a leading place, probably the highest in the contemporary world. Yet he is in the direct succession of a line of great thinkers, hailing from Plato, through the Greek Fathers and the medieval mystics, to modern seers like Khomiakov, Dostoievski, and Soloviev. His work, however, is more imbued with philosophical learning than theirs, and is more relevant to recent world-conditions. As a guide to the spirit of the Russian people, as distinct from the politicians, it is unique, whilst it is also the utterance of a good European. In particular, the Russian communal temperament is strongly marked in him, but controlled by a love of liberty which he associated with the philosophy of Kant.

Thus the Orthodox respect for tradition combined in him with the Protestant love of independence, without much concession to the authoritarianism of the Roman Church, to which his wife gave her allegiance. Yet his mind was truly catholic and comprehensive, making him at home with the sincere unbeliever and atheist as well as the nondescript Y.M.C.A. believer or orthodox churchman. But through all his works resound the truly Russian themes of Creativity, the significance of History, of God-manhood, of the Last Things, and of mystical Intuition. These were always supported, however, by rational arguments, and were not preachments or ejaculations after the manner of Carlyle. From early days he felt a 'call' to be a philosopher, and, whilst born an aristocrat, regarded compassion as the basis of all social reform. Consequently he had no love of militarism in any form, and though passionately attached to Russia in her struggle with Germany, held that his mission after the two world wars was the promotion of peace. His formal education was nourished upon history and science, not upon religion, and enriched by the literature of Russia, by German philosophy, and French culture. Altogether he was as a youth precocious and independent, and though he attended the University of Kiev, he did not take a degree there.

II—THE RADICAL

From about 1874 to 1907 Berdyáev was engaged in the revolutionary agitations of young Russia, though without approval of methods of violence. His associations with the rebellious students of his time led, however, to his banishment to a desolate region of North Russia, where he received, like so many of his companions, an education in radicalism which lasted to the end of his life. Liberty became a passion with him, but not equality, for he wrote an essay upon 'The Philosophy of Inequality' in 1923 and always remained something of the aristocrat. His radicalism was primarily moral, and involved a transfiguration of the world by spiritual means. He adopted Dostoievski's maxim that the world will be saved by beauty: an idea thoroughly Russian, but one not greatly developed in Berdyáev's

writings. It accords, nevertheless, with his later acceptance of the rites of the Orthodox Church, which are more aesthetic than doctrinal, and with his own literary style, which is pictorial rather than abstract. Indeed, the diffuseness of his writings has much in common with the manner of Coleridge and Maurice, being imaginative, rich and stimulating, instead of logical and precise.

Return from banishment enabled him to pursue his philosophical studies in Heidelberg under Windelband, that master of the history of philosophy, who yet was himself so critical in drawing speculative conclusions. Berdyáev's radicalism was confirmed by his connexions with thinkers of the left wing in politics, but the influence of Bulgakov, a Marxist turned Orthodox, and of his wife and her sister, both revolutionaries, helped to turn him in a religious direction. His thinking and reading were eclectic, but the ideas of Vladimir Soloviev, Russia's chief systematic philosopher, prevailed, and together with the spectacle of evil in the world—war, revolution and terror—led him to a religious crisis. Berdyáev sought the Absolute: perfection and eternity, God. He found this in the Christianity of the Russian Church, to which he ever afterwards adhered, though not uncritically. This venture he described not as a conversion in the catastrophic sense, but as series of recurrent crises. These crises arose from a deepening sense of the mystery of the universe, a mystery to which he devoted his mature powers, and which he tried by speculative efforts to solve. The problem of evil weighed upon him increasingly, as war, famine and vice multiplied in human affairs, and his crises ended only with his death. Radical evil demanded a radical solution.

III—THE PROPHET

From about 1907 to 1914 he worked at his problem. A partial solution he found in the acceptance of democratic socialism, though not of Nazism or Bolshevism. He feared the coming of the Grand Inquisitor, in the form of the union of the State and the Ideologist, which should offer to the people 'bread' without spiritual liberty. He discerned this in the bureaucracy of both the West European world (including the U.S.A.) and the Russian police-State. Uniformity, conventionalism, the commonplace and the fashionable, were his abhorrence, but he found deliverance in the adoption of Christianity in spirit and in truth. The religious philosophy of Soloviev was his guide, but he made intimate contacts with all sorts of beliefs, from those of cranks and sectarians, Freemasons, and free-thinkers, to ultra-orthodox monks and hermits. The mystics of the Middle Ages, together with Böhme and Kant, supplied him with clues to a deeper apprehension of the mysteries of religion. Thus he worked out a philosophy of Freedom, which became the groundwork of an original Existentialism centring in the notion of personality. A study of art in Italy confirmed his belief in creativeness, but not in evolution, for he felt a presentiment of the coming of catastrophic revolution.

The first World War presented itself to Berdyáev as a strife between Christ and Anti-Christ—a very Russian theme. This was not the same as conflict between Russia and Germany, but between the old and the new régimes in the world. But he believed that Russia had spiritual resources, untapped in the West, which could regenerate the world. Russia had the feminine spirit, fertile and sympathetic, which, combined with the masculine temper of the West, would bring about a spiritual renaissance. However, he remained true to his people and to his religion, for he recognized that 'culture is born of the cult'. He was thus opposed spiritually,

not politically, to the Bolsheviks and wrote his *Philosophy of Inequality*, which he afterwards regretted. Constantly concerned with spiritual values, he promoted various philosophic enterprises, even for a while managing a bookshop, and coming under the suspicion of the politicians. He wrote on the meaning of history, refusing to believe in inevitable progress, and warning of impending catastrophe to the world. For a while professor in Moscow, by which title he was recognized in Cambridge many years afterwards, his criticisms of the official views led to his condemnation by the revolutionary State, and to his expulsion from Russia along with more than one hundred intellectuals who were unsympathetic to the ruling ideology.

IV—THE ESCHATOLOGIST

Berdyáev left Russia with sorrow, but without resentment, for he felt partially responsible, as an aristocrat, for his country's condition. 'All are responsible for all.' And he regarded himself as a missionary to Western Europe, explaining the Russian Idea. That idea took shape as the transformation of the world into the Cosmic Church, a Christian cultural society. For many years he worked first in Berlin and then in Paris, largely under the auspices of the Y.M.C.A., to promote this ideal, which he found to be compatible with his approval of the Russian Church in its support of the Soviet Government. The notion of spiritual freedom took increasing hold upon him as he grew older, and he wrote a series of books, of which *Five Meditations upon Solitude and Society*, *Freedom and the Spirit*, *The Destiny of Man*, and *The Meaning of History* are among the chief. Their theme is the nature of man, of civilization and its fate in history, and of the future of human personality. It can truly be said that rarely have those questions been probed so deeply. At the same time he followed the course of world-politics with an apprehensive eye, till in 1939 the storm of war broke again, and he took refuge for a short while from the Nazis, together with his relatives, amongst friends in the South of France. He soon returned to Paris to face the chaotic conditions there.

His last days were as fertile as ever. With scanty means, standing in queues, and 'with a headful of Kant', he struggled valiantly to expound his philosophy of spiritual freedom in such books as *The Realm of the Spirit* and *The Realm of Caesar*, and *The Russian Idea*. His view of the Last Things found expression in *Eschatological Metaphysics*, a truly remarkable work. His *Spiritual Autobiography* describes his religious and philosophical history, and is a most moving document. Unfortunately the book upon Mysticism which should have crowned his philosophy was never written. A small amount of his writings has still to be translated from Russian, German, and French sources, but his version of the mystic life can but be conjectured. His later days were full of honour and reputation and sorrow. Cambridge made him, rather incongruously, a D.D., and he was described by the Public Orator, more appropriately, as 'the second Socrates'. Like the first Socrates, however, he remains for the populace an enigmatic figure, for his countrymen an ostracized patriot of the land he loved, and for the scholarly an object of reverence and wonder. His thought will take long to be assimilated, but it will do very much to heal the breach between East and West, and to guide the onward march of humanity in peaceful co-operation.

V—THE PERSONALIST

It was said by Berdyáev's relatives that he prepared for a journey as if it were an eschatological catastrophe. Certainly he thought that human society should prepare for such an event, and saw evidence of it in the present plight of humanity. Yet he was not one who believed in the dominance of impersonal forces, such as State capitalism or social bureaucracy. His outlook was humanistic and personalistic. Personality was his watchword, both in politics and religion. His Kantian philosophy had taught him that persons are ends in themselves, never mere means; that there is a radical evil in human nature, but that we can get beyond this nature to a deeper reality; and that the guide to ultimate reality is personal morality. Personality is the highest good, but it must be transfigured by mystical experience in which beauty plays the chief role. This mystical aestheticism is left undefined by him, but the cults of personalism in the Western world have much in common with the idea of God-manhood as advocated by the Russian spiritual thinkers. The ikon is a symbol of transfigured human nature, and God-manhood should involve close inter-personal relations.

Berdyáev's life exemplified his theories. He was not an academic or professional philosopher, but an original creative thinker. His love of liberty was bound up with his love of truth, and his crusade against the prevalent lies of our time was part of his creed that 'ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free'. He made personal contacts with inquiring minds all over Europe, and though not easy in social intercourse, had a truly Russian delight in continual discussions. Yet he also had a great love of solitude, in which he pondered the great questions of life, death, and judgement. Well-bred and distinguished in manner, he did not profess to imitate the populace, still less the *bourgeoisie*, but sought to inspire and instruct them by word and deed. He was fond of women friends, and was greatly dependent on his wife and sister-in-law, yet he cut away from home ties and even from Mother Russia for the sake of liberty and truth. An assiduous writer, he died sitting at his desk, and the grave dug for him was found to be too small! A prophetic event: for Berdyáev's fame as a Christian philosopher and seer has still to break its bounds, both in Russia and the rest of the world.

ATKINSON LEE

THE FAMILY OF GOD TODAY

It is equally impossible for man to be content with a spiritual society that is not universal, and a universal society that is not spiritual. FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE

THE CHALLENGE OF COMMUNISM

THE feature of the nineteenth century was industrial revolution—of the present century, economic revolution. The watchwords of the one were freedom and enterprise—of the other, unity and security.

In the pursuit of unity and security, immense issues are involved. A world society becomes the inevitable goal. What *kind* of world society is the supreme issue. The contest is opened: Communism has thrown down the gauntlet; the challenge is to the Christian Church. These are the theses of this article.

Western civilization sailed into the new century on a smooth sea, under a calm breeze, but in 1914 struck hidden rocks. The ship-wrecked crew sought (in a League of Nations) unity and security. Neither unity nor security was found: a second World War followed and unity and security are still to seek. They are being sought more eagerly than ever—at least by the mass of mankind.

The Russian communist revolution of 1917 was unsuspected. Marx had set no Western nation aflame, nor seemed likely to do so. His influence was thought to be waning. The embrace of Marx by Russia's own indigenous revolutionary spirit made all the difference—a *world* of difference. As a result, the challenge of Revolutionary Communism has become the most significant fact of contemporary history, and the most relevant to our theme—the Family of God.

The history of Communism is long and chequered: often heroic, sometimes pathetic, today tragic, and threatening to become catastrophic. But the differences between historic and revolutionary Communism are so great that it behoves us to compare them and beware. The word 'Communism' has, through its historic associations, a subtle power with sentimental idealists, disposing them to give support to a revolutionary Communism that is the very antithesis of historic Communism.

Historic Communism has been, for more than two thousand years, the most mild, benevolent, and pacific form of society known to history. In this alone, nothing imaginable could be in greater contrast to the materialism, hatred, and class war of Revolutionary Communism.

The famous Communism of Plato's *Republic* stands apart from the countless experiments in religious Communism. It was in fact, not an experiment, it was a speculation arising from a profound philosophy of unity and order. There was to be common ownership and possession of all things—wives included. Marriages were to be State-controlled: children to be wards of the State and ignorant of their natural parents. But this Communism was to apply only to the 'guardians' and 'auxiliaries'—the wise men and the soldiers—who would guide and guard the State. Communism of possessions would secure them against personal envies and ambitions. For the rest, the farmer, the craftsman and tradesman will follow their respective callings. Slavery is accepted as a natural and necessary condition. One thing is quite certain: Plato was far from sharing Marx's estimate of the proletariat as pre-eminently fitted to rule.

Effective criticism of Plato's Communism came quickly from his disciple

Aristotle who showed that the loss of family relationships would be a disastrous impoverishment of social life.¹

Our own Platonist—probably our greatest—Frederick Denison Maurice, says: 'The Republic teaches how the noblest student of humanity in his eagerness to grasp the Universal is likely to lose sight of the particular.'² In a close analysis, Maurice says: 'Plato felt that there should be some body which expresses, not the law of a confined distinct national life but the law of *society itself*, the principle of its unity. But with this universal society Plato does not see how distinct relationships are compatible . . . how such a society as this could grow out of a national community, out of a family, and yet could preserve uninjured, in harmony with itself, both these holy institutions which had been its cradle—this he did not know; this wisdom was reserved for the shepherds of Palestine. . . . This *was* permitted to the sage of Greece—to feel the necessity of a universal community.'³

Countless adventures in Communism have had their origin and inspiration in religion. They bear an impressive likeness. A representative example is that of the Essenes, a Jewish sect living mostly—not exclusively—on the Plain of Judea about 250 B.C. They were a community of some 4,000 people who, by their consistency of life, their industry and courage under persecution, compelled the admiration of their contemporaries. Historians are unanimous in their tributes. No tortures could terrify them into disloyalty to their Order. They avoided marriage but adopted children from outside the Order, while many of mature years were drawn from a life of disillusion to seek in their community a haven of rest and peace. Their manner of life clearly foreshadowed the monastic communities of Christian history.

The numerous adventures of modern days in which unsatisfied and often-persecuted religious sects have left Europe (mostly Germany) to settle in the wide spaces of the Americas bear similar features to those of the Essenes. While not always practising celibacy, they have tended to disparage the family. 'The question of the family has been found to be insoluble in Communism.'⁴

A feature important for our purpose is that acceptance of implicit obedience to elders or leader—inseparable from Communism—has led to the loss of personal initiative by members of the community. This was noted at the dissolution of the Community of Separatists at Zoar in 1898. Others found they must work harder! The blacksmith said: 'I'm my own boss now but I've got to work harder.' Another said with pride: 'This is *ours*; we *bought* it. Isn't it nice to have your own horse?'

Even more relevant is the fact that while these religious communities have, within the limits of their order, *achieved* Communism, Marxism preaching Communism has *achieved* class war.

It is sufficient reference to the Communism of Saint Simon and Fourier to note—in due place—the elements in Marxism taken over from each. The Russian revolutionaries had already borrowed from both—as was their wont with Western ideas—before finally embracing Marx.

We come then to Marx—to Marx himself, not his theories, first. Marx is far more important than Marxism, even for an understanding of Marxism. Marx, toward the end of his life, declared that 'whatever else he was he was not a Marxist'. Whatever he meant by that statement it justifies a beginning with Marx himself. Yet writers on Marx have, almost with one accord, followed him into his perfect maze of abstract and interminable theorizing, instead of making a close and discerning study of the man himself. Introductory sketches of his life deal

mostly with externals, with little or no attempt at analysis. Marx happens to be a bundle of incarnate *fact*, far more important than all theory—even his own. It is as true of Marx as of any other man and, in spite of Marx, that 'Out of the heart are the issues of life'.⁸

The fundamental and far the most important fact about Marx is that he was a Jew. That he deplored the fact is notorious but that did not alter the fact, except to add to its importance. 'He rarely spoke about his life, and never about his origin. The fact that he was a Jew neither he nor Engels ever mentions. His references to individual Jews . . . are virulent to a degree: his origin had become a personal stigma which he was unable to avoid pointing out in others.' What a study is here for the psychologist! He would surely predict an explosion. The explosion came, and it proved to be a volcano in frequent eruption. But there was no escape for Marx from his origin. His Hebrew heritage clung to him through life. It is in him, and will out—in some form. The Hebrew idea of Righteousness haunts him, dominates him. He will not—cannot—proclaim it in its positive form, as a devout Hebrew. It becomes negative: 'He was endowed with an acute sense of *injustice*.'⁹ In its unfolding it is first secularized and then rationalized in terms of economic theory. So Marx is able to retain his self-respect and self-confidence—not by agreeing with the idea of Righteousness but by making it agree with him. And for his chosen and afflicted people he adopts the proletariat of the world. This imparted a real spaciousness to his message and to his influence. There is in it a messianism becoming a Hebrew prophet, though confessedly a secular one. His blazing sense of injustice he brought to the victims of exploitation, arousing them to resentment, anger, hatred. The class war is imperative—a secularized 'holy war'. The proletariat are to have no law but their own interests. They are the rulers—dictators; let them take the law—all law—into their own hands.

Marx 'believed that the fundamental mainspring of action in the life of a man is *all the more powerful for not being recognized*'.¹⁰ This is just what we have seen in Marx himself. He also declared that men have tended to construct elaborate rationalizations in moral codes and religious organizations to explain away their economic needs. Marx himself did exactly that—in *reverse*. His 'elaborate rationalizations' flowed in the opposite direction. He rationalized his 'acute sense of injustice', his moral wrath, his Hebrew heritage with its Idea of Righteousness, in an elaborate never-ending labyrinth of economic theory to 'explain away' the inescapable past of which he was ashamed. 'The fire of his moral indignation', says an acute commentator—violently as he would have repudiated the description—'can still kindle fire and confidence in hearts and minds burdened by the sight or the experience of triumphant injustice and exploitation.'¹¹

Many have noticed in Marx both the economic theorizer and the blazing prophet. H. M. Hyndman, recording his personal impressions of Marx says: 'The contrast between his manner of utterance when deeply stirred by anger, and his attitude when giving his views on economic events of the period, was very marked. He turned from the role of prophet and violent denunciator to that of calm philosopher without apparent effort.'¹²

Mr Middleton Murray long ago likened Marx, in certain of his moods, to the Hebrew prophets. The likeness is striking if we allow, in Marx, for the secularization and inversion of the Idea of Righteousness. Here lay the secret of his power. He thundered the fact of exploitation in the ears of the workers unceasingly. For

this he drew upon the Hebrew Idea of Righteousness without acknowledgement. This is one of the leaves that 'Communism has taken from the Christian book and misread'.¹²

Mr Isaiah Berlin says: 'Others before him had preached a war between the classes but it was he who conceived and put into practice a plan designed to achieve the political organization of a class solely fighting for its interests as a class. . . . Yet in his own eyes and those of his contemporaries he appeared first and foremost a theoretical economist. The classical premises on which his economic doctrines rest are today largely superseded: contemporary discussion proceeds upon a different basis.'¹³ Clearly then it is *not* to his economic theorizing that Marx owes his power and influence: it is to that Hebrew Idea, born of religion and brought in secular and inverted form to bear upon the raw wounds of the victims of economic injustice.

Mr G. H. D. Cole's interpretation points unconsciously—and no doubt unwillingly—to the same conclusion. After having laboured to make clear what Marx meant by his labour theory of surplus value, he concludes: 'He is always reaching out after a *real Oneness* underlying the phenomenal multiplicity of the capitalist world. He envisages a working class . . . in process of *becoming one*. This oneness alone is real. The prices of individual commodities are mere appearances. *What is real is the one fact of exploitation*.'¹⁴ It is a temptation to write here, Q.E.D.

This certainly puts the bulky *Das Kapital* in its place. Labour-value as a price-measure does not matter after all! Yet—the facts of exploitation excepted—that was the theme of *Das Kapital*. Those who have found it the most tedious book they have ever read should feel relieved. They do not need to understand it!

'The fact of exploitation' was not new. More than two thousand years ago the Hebrew prophets denounced it in words as blistering as any Marx ever used:

You haters of right and lovers of wrong,
is not a sense of justice due from you?
But they devour my people's flesh
and strip them of their skin,
laying their very bones bare,
chopping them up like flesh for the pot,
like meat in a cauldron.¹⁵

That is but one of those Hebrew prophets whose message of social justice has never been surpassed (the Sermon on the Mount is more than justice) and strangely anticipated the modern Hebrew, Marx. They, however, 'nailed their theses' on the right doors. The foundation of their message was positive: He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?¹⁶

Considering the brevity of historic time against the vast age of the world, Micah and Marx are not far apart in time, and nearer in thought than Marx cared to think.

The secularizing process was made easy for Marx. Born of Jewish parents who had adopted Christianity, he combined a Hebrew heritage with Christian instruction. But, unfortunately, he lived in an age of the most extreme sceptical criticism of the New Testament. Strauss had just written his famous *Life of Jesus* representing Jesus as a mythical figure. Bruno Bauer (a close friend of Marx) at once went

farther and denied the historic person of Jesus altogether. Bauer, in spite of his scepticism, remained religious. This was too much for Marx; his positivist mind revolted against such an attitude. In this mood, another influence found him. He undertook the review of a book by Feuerbach, a less able man than himself but 'a materialist at a time when Marx was reacting violently against the subtlety of the decadent idealism in which he has been immersed'¹⁷ in his association with the Bauers. He embraced materialism and, into the framework of the Hegelian dialectic, he put a materialist content. This sufficed for his economic concept of man—for that he needed no spiritual explanation; dialectical materialism will do. But it will *not* do as an explanation of Marx himself—his moral indignation, his passionate rage against oppression and his championship of the oppressed. For the source of these we must look—Marx's protests notwithstanding—to his Hebrew heritage.

Marx was an immense borrower. The framework of his philosophy he took over from Hegel; his scepticism from Strauss and the Bauers; his materialism from Feuerbach; his economic interpretation of history and class conflict from Saint-Simon; his labour theory of value from Ricardo and the classical economists; his slogan 'religion is the opium of the people' from an English clergyman (condemning a narrow pietism). What he did *not* borrow were the things that really mattered—his moral assumptions, implied, if unconfessed, throughout; his forceful personality and his powerful mind. Equipped with these he used his borrowed materials to build up a bulky and imposing body of doctrine that lay wide open alike to effective criticism or to apt quotation. But through all, in spite of all, and more important than all his theorizing, he succeeded in compelling the attention of the world to the importance of the economic factors in human society, and the consequent evils inherent in an uncontrolled capitalism—the evils of exploitation. This was his great achievement.

Having carefully avoided the maze of Marx's prolific theorizing—in which many have lost their way—we may look at what he claimed *as his own*, and (for once) stated briefly. 'In a letter written in 1852 he stated what he regarded as original.' The italics are Marx's.

'What I did that was new was to prove (1) that the *existence of classes* is only bound up with particular historic phases in the history of production; (2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to the *dictatorship of the proletariat*; (3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the *abolition of all classes* to a classless society.'¹⁸

What is to be said of such a claim; of such *proofs*? What sort of philosophy is it that can make such a claim? The only thing to be said is that they are not proofs at all. A glance at them is sufficient to show this. They are no more than unproved hypotheses; and subsequent history has been steadily disproving them all. To take them in detail: no historian of repute would agree with (1). Professor Butterfield writes: 'It is not a disembodied idea, as some men have thought, and not an economic factor, as Marxists assert, but the incalculability of a human personality that is the starting-point of historical change. A knowledge of the economics of the seventeenth century will not explain the power of Oliver Cromwell, or the poetry of Milton.'¹⁹ Marx himself is an excellent illustration. No economic process explains him. As for (2) and (3), there is no proved necessity for the dictatorship of the proletariat; nor is there the slightest promise or faintest hope (where

dictatorship in the name of the proletariat prevails) of the emergence of a classless society.

Prone to abstraction and prolific of theory, Marx was too trustful of his theoretic conclusions to be either a sound philosopher or a safe guide. Little wonder that his theories have become an embarrassment to his thoughtful admirers like G. D. H. Cole, and practitioners like Lenin. Lenin, organizer of revolution and realist, pushed the theories about as he *willed*, rather than as he *thought*, even if he gave a 'Marxist' reason for having done so!

Marx's interpretation of Labour Value, reducing all forms of labour to the common denominator of manual toil, then smoothing out all quantitative differences by his fiction of 'an average day's labour', constitutes a 'labour calculus' reminiscent of Bentham's famous 'pleasure calculus', and not a whit more—rather less—convincing.

His conception of man was false; it was not natural. Man is not born in a factory but in a family; not as an economic unit but as an infant, dependent from birth, not for bread alone, but for love—a word not found in all Marx's philosophy.

Marx was singularly lacking in constructive thought. Given his revolution, the rest would follow; would just happen. The State would conveniently 'fade away' and the classless society as conveniently emerge.

But while Marx was a poor philosopher he was a mighty preacher—too mighty, in fact, to be a philosopher. All his thinking was made to serve his passionate evangel. He ranks, in calibre, with the greatest prophets and evangelists of all time. It is in the spirit of his message that he differs: it springs from resentment; it is a gospel of hate. Such negative relations are essentially evil, breeding 'battle, murder, and sudden death'. There is deep wisdom in the words: 'Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer.'¹⁰ This is not to say that such a message has been less effective—human nature being what it is; nor that it was not inevitable—in the world as it is, and with the Church failing of her positive mission.

When we pass from Marx to Lenin, we enter another atmosphere—from Hebrew to Russian messianism. 'Messianic consciousness is more characteristic of the Russians than of any other people except the Jews.'¹¹ The significance of this change, not generally realized, is of the first importance in understanding the Russian revolution. Russian Communism is not to be equated with Marxism. Berdyaev is insistent that 'A knowledge of Marxism will not help us to understand it'¹² (Russian Communism). They have different origins. The late Archbishop Temple considered Berdyaev one of the most significant thinkers of our time. In nothing was he more significant than in his interpretation of Russia to the West. Here he is supreme. With unequalled knowledge and insight he interprets her history, her great imaginative writers, and the rise of her revolutionaries.

The Russian revolutionary movement was much older than Marxism. It had shown an inveterate habit of borrowing ideas from the West; but it always added an emotional element. 'What was scientific theory in the West, a hypothesis or, in any case, a relative truth . . . became for the Russian intelligentsia a dogma, a sort of religious revelation. . . . In this totalitarian and dogmatic way they accepted and lived through Saint-Simonism, Fourierism, Hegelianism, materialism, Marxism—Marxism in particular.'¹³

Russia, deeply divided in war and in defeat fell to pieces and was ripe for the long-desired revolution. There was more than an element of truth in the words

of H. G. Wells after visiting Lenin: 'The Communists did not conquer Russia; they took charge of a derelict ship.' To change the metaphor, the Russian revolutionaries had already loaded the gun; Marx supplied the spark; Lenin directed its aim. The revolution was in process when Lenin arrived in Russia to direct its course.

Yet Russia *had* an Idea of her own. Berdyaev is so certain of this that one of his books bears the title *The Russian Idea*. On the first page he quotes a warning word from Tyutchev: 'Russia is not to be understood by intellectual processes. Russia is emotional—passionate.' It is possible to give a name to the Russian Idea in a single word—Compassion. The Idea of Compassion was born of ascetic Christianity in the presence of human suffering. It had long been the mark of the Russian saint; it became the original inspiration of the intelligentsia! When Radishchev in his *Journey from Paris to Moscow* wrote the words, 'I looked around me and my soul was lacerated by the sufferings of mankind', the Russian Intelligentsia was born. Radishchev was the most notable phenomenon in Russia in the eighteenth century.³⁴ This Compassion was driven to revolt by the tyranny of a despotic State served by a pliant official Church. The Intelligentsia became increasingly revolutionary and the Idea they carried became secularized and inverted until, in the words of Berdyaev, 'Russian atheism was born of compassion'.³⁵ Compassion, divorced from religion, was rationalized in terms of social revolution; 'humaneness disrupted from God and from God-man is born inhumaneness'. Compassion is inverted to cruelty, seen in liquidation, torture, and prison camp—and all for the sake of the poor!

Russian Communism is an indigenous growth. The emergence of Lenin the Russian is not dissimilar from that of Marx the Hebrew. As Toynbee points out) Lenin's heritage (father a Slavophil; grandfather a devout Orthodox Christian, makes it possible for him to accept Marxism (though from the West) because 'it puts the West on the spot', and Russia can remain 'Holy Russia'.³⁶ For Russia must be right, always right. That is her Byzantine heritage. Orthodoxy—Russian Orthodoxy—is vital.

Modern visitors to Russia do well to remember that a thousand years' history of the Russian soul will tell us more than a thousand miles journey over Russian soil. That history is not in serious dispute.

The primitive Russian tribes were characterized by a wild nature-paganism. The impact of Byzantine Christianity produced a dualism that has persisted throughout Russian history: a fierce asceticism over against a passionate paganism. Asceticism centred in the monasteries; paganism flowed over the plain. The asceticism, in secularized form has marked the revolutionary intelligentsia to this day.

Byzantium bequeathed her characteristic relationship of Prince and Prelate, State and Church; the Prince taking precedence over Prelate and State over Church. Prelate and Church subserve a Holy Empire. Stalin was the perfect Czar in a 'sacred' Bolshevik Russia.

Orthodoxy came from the same source and suited well the extreme, maximalist temper of the Russian soul. Russia must have an orthodoxy, whether of religion (e.g. the *filioque* of the Creed) or of ideology. Russian orthodoxy is the only true orthodoxy. Compromise is unthinkable—the unpardonable sin. Many a moral delinquency may be overlooked—ideological deviation never. This is not a slight barrier in relations with the *experimental* West.

Lenin was as truly Russian as Marx was Hebrew, and both were men of fate. Lenin was the perfect revolutionary. Russian revolutionary history became incarnate in him. Its asceticism, its orthodoxy, its 'wholeness' all found expression in him. Autocratic, ruthless, intolerant, the softer side of his nature became atrophied. This he confessed in a conversation with Gorki. 'After listening to Beethoven's *Appassionata* he said that "music seduced him into uttering amiable stupidities and stroking people's heads while it was his duty to be splitting skulls ruthlessly".' Recording this conversation, Fülöp-Miller comments: 'It shows in an appalling way the inner conflict in the soul of this apostle of level-headedness.'²⁷

But the mortal enemy was not music; it was religion. 'Lenin hated the very word "religion".'²⁸ He declared that if Bolshevism prevailed, Christianity would disappear; but if Christianity prevailed, Bolshevism would disappear. He demanded that every member of the Party must be a militant atheist. What Lenin hated, in Russia is submerged. *Through God's Underground*²⁹ is a significant title to a tragic and moving record. In that submerged part of Russia, and in voices reaching it from without, lies the fear of her present rulers and the explanation of the Iron Curtain. Failure, whether from collapse within, or corrosion from without, before the challenge of a higher faith, would be for the Bolshevik faithful, the outer darkness.

One great difference between Marx and Lenin calls for comment. Marx put the emphasis on economics; 'Lenin asserted the obvious primacy of politics over economics'.³⁰ Marx was politically vague; Lenin promptly seized the political despotism of the Czars. Dame Sybil Thorndyke put this to effective proof by a plain question to Mr Maisky (when Ambassador to Britain). She asked him why the Soviets had marred such a great experiment by totalitarian methods and practices. Mr Maisky replied: 'Well, Madam, the Czars trained us in those methods and practices; we knew no other, and we had no time to learn.'³¹

So was established Russia's third empire—after the Muscovite, the Petrine; after the Petrine, the Bolshevik.

It is no apology for the earlier empires to say that the treatment of political prisoners under them was mildness itself compared with the ruthless efficiency of that under the Bolshevik régime. Let Lenin's own experience bear witness. During his imprisonment at Shushenk (Siberia) Madam Lenin was allowed to live with him. This is what she says: 'Living was very cheap. Lenin received the Government allowance of eight roubles a month and for that got a clean room, food, drink and laundry. Once a week a sheep was killed for him. When the sheep was eaten, meat was again prepared for a week. There were cutlets for eight days. There was plenty of milk for Lenin and his dog. Lenin's pastimes were duck shooting and skating.' Madam Lenin then adds a little on the distaff side. She says: 'In the summer it was generally difficult to get servants, so Mama and I had to struggle with the malicious ways of the stove. To begin with, I often upset the cooking-pot, but soon I became accustomed to cooking. In October we engaged a servant girl, a young person not quite thirteen, who soon assumed the management of the whole household.'³² What comment is adequate—even possible?

Though Marx and Lenin were different—rather because of it—they were interdependent. Russia needed the fuel of Marxist doctrine; Marxism needed—for its world revolutionary goal—the flame of the Russian maximalist, totalitarian spirit. Marxism had shown no sign of producing such revolution. The nations of

the West—Britain most of all—had decided against being cut in two by class war. It seemed likely that the influence of Marx would fade away and his speculations be relegated to the records of economic history. One of the learned dictionaries had in 1910 concluded an authentic article on Communism with these words: 'That Socialism' (of various brands) 'is spreading rapidly is not a matter requiring proof. Communism, however, is distinctly losing ground. It held a more prominent place in men's thoughts half a century ago than it does today. It is impossible to imagine a group of thinkers now being captured by a system of Communism as the intellectuals of Paris were held by the views of Saint-Simon.'²² But in Russia there had long been a fire glowing beneath the surface that in 1917 burst into flame, to be duly stoked by Lenin and Trotsky with Marxist fuel. The world knows the result.

One thing both men had in common—a consuming rage against exploitation. This was their strength and the secret of their influence. They blazed the fact of exploitation before the proletariat of the West and the workers of Russia respectively, urging each to anger and hatred, and to take the law—and vengeance—into their own hands. Lenin proved vastly more successful than Marx had ever been, owing to the long preparation for the inevitable revolution and the defeat in war that brought the climax.

The following passage is a fair estimate, in brief, of the revolution. 'The 1917 revolution was so devastating in its effects and consequences only because it was an explosion of indigenous forces which had long been accumulating under the heavy pressure of czarism. The blast was primarily directed against the foreign ideas, institutions and customs symbolized by Peter the Great's capital, St Petersburg.'²³

Yet we have the following criticism of this passage by the reviewer: 'To depict Lenin and Trotsky as the authors of an indigenous Russian revolution directed against the infiltration of western influences into Russia is surely a strange and rather wilful misreading of history.'²⁴

It is the reviewer who is guilty of the 'misreading history': (1) in imputing the authorship of the revolution to Lenin and Trotsky; (2) in failing to allow for the long preparation by the Intelligentsia; (3) the important part played 'primarily' by the *narodniks* and Slavophiles with their traditionally Russian antipathy to the West.

As for Trotsky and the Marxist purists—where are they now? The realism of the Russian revolution under Lenin and Stalin has liquidated them. Meanwhile the Russian revolution rolls on—or rather rolls round—not to a classless society but to a third Russian Empire.

Lenin, following the Russian tradition, had turned to the West for doctrine, and Marx supplied it in abundance, with ready-made slogans thrown in. The voluminous Marxist doctrine was imposing—not least to those who understood little of it—and lent itself to adaptation to a Russian situation never visualized by Marx. Lenin's realist temper gaily interpreted it, or developed it, to meet any and every emergency. The Russian spirit has moulded Marxism to its own pattern.

Berdyaev avers that 'Lenin was an imperialist; his whole thought was imperialist, despotic. Lenin was not a theoretician of Marxism like Plekhanov, but a theoretician of revolution.'²⁵ He certainly proved ruthless in revolution, and unhesitating in taking over the czarist despotism.

Stalin, without doubt, added his distinctive contribution. He had long made a study of nationalities and became, after the revolution, the first Commissar of Nationalities. Stalin made the very un-Marxist addition of an intense Russian nationalism. Nationalism had no place in Marx's philosophy; yet nowhere in the world is it more intense than in 'Marxist' Russia and modern Israel! The war favoured the process in Russia. Her historic heroes were resurrected and revered. Patriotism flamed in the hearts of Russian Communists. Eve Curie has recorded in her *Journey among Warriors* the amazement and incredulity of the Russian workers that western Communists were unwilling to fight for their own country (at the beginning of the last war). What sort of fools, they demanded, were they to be deterred from fighting for their native land?

It may be asked: 'Where does Marxist *theory* fit in with Lenin's seizure of a despotic régime, or with Stalin's inculcation of nationalism?' The most effective answer is suggested by the fate of the Marxist old guard.

Meanwhile Russia expands. This, too, accords with Russian tradition, not with Marxist doctrine. Prior to the revolution, Russia expanded at the rate of fifty square miles a day for four hundred years. Since the revolution, who can measure? It is inevitable that Lenin's imperialism and Stalin's nationalism should make for expansion, while a thoroughly inconsistent Communist propaganda prepares the way.

By common consent, Russian policy has changed. Instead of aiming at direct and immediate world revolution—as the orthodox Marxists urged—Russia claims to be the 'Motherland of World Communism'. And a most strict mother she is. Her will is law throughout the Communist world, and she will put up with no nonsense from any of her children. How could she—Russia the orthodox—permit deviation? Russia must be right, always and totally right. Since orthodox she must be, compromise she cannot. The other party is always wrong; she never. Ruthlessly, remorselessly, by all means, by subtle adaptations, and so by devious routes, she pursues her own goal—a 'Communist' world, dominated and directed from Moscow—the third Rome.

But what is this Russian 'Communism', this amazing edifice, having for its apex the worship of Lenin's embalmed body, and the adoration of Stalin, as a demigod? 'There is not, and never has been, his equal', says *Pravda*. Here is a verse from a Communist psalm broadcast by Prague radio a few months ago: 'You are the hope of the world, Comrade Stalin, its dream, its aspiration; your name spells immortality; fields adore you, for you have made them green with plenty; the rays of the sun are grateful to you, for you have made them to shine into the homes of millions that lived in darkness.'"

What sort of Communism is this? Let it be granted that Marx's use of the word 'communism' derives from the revolutionary *Paris Commune* and not from the religious experiments of Historic Communism; can this Russian set-up be called Communism? Does it not much more closely resemble the National Socialism of pre-war Germany, with its *fuhrer princeps*, and its idolatry of Hitler? National Socialism in Germany; national Communism in Russia; what is the difference?

It is not surprising that Berdyaev should say: 'Stalin is a leader-dictator in the fascist sense of the word.'"

THE ENCOUNTER

When we come to a comparison, or contrast, of Christianity and Communism, we

find ample room for confusion of thought. This should not surprise us if we remember that the facts of the contemporary world are the same for both and present the same challenge to each; that there is a background of ideas (consciously or unconsciously influencing the mind) common to both. There are bound to be common elements in diagnosis of the world situation.

Confusion is certain if we fail to keep the Marxist diagnosis distinct from the Marxist remedy. To lump both together and call it Marxism is fatal. It is the Marxist *remedy* that matters. It is with this that Christianity can have nothing in common. There must be a judgement of means (the remedy) as well as ends. The Marxist means will determine the end *actually* reached, while destroying the end *originally* sought. 'Gustav Landauer, whom Martin Buber called a Jewish prophet, foresaw that a Marxist revolution would, in the end, give birth to a monster that would outdo Capitalism in lack of humanity and outright cruelty.'¹ The more consistent the Marxism, the more devastating is the result.

Confusion is most common among sentimentalists and scientists of positivist bent. The sentimentalist, of benevolent frame of mind, fondly imagines that a beneficent communism—akin to Historic Communism—survives under a ruthless despotism. The police State, the prison camps, the purges, the sacrifice of large sections of the community, the iron curtain and all it hides, are conveniently ignored; the assumed surviving core of communism is all that matters. The Dean of Canterbury is the outstanding instance of this delusion.

The scientific positivist is prone to see in Marxism just another category of scientific thought, within which social justice and economic equality are not only practicable but comparatively easy of attainment by simple logical process. He tends to become impatient with the fools who cannot follow him. Professor Bernal is an eminent instance.

It is imperative, in meeting and answering the challenge of Communism, that we do not confuse the diagnosis with the remedy; they are distinct and of different value. With the diagnosis the Christian cannot be in complete disagreement; with the remedy he must be.

In the Marxist diagnosis we find (1) the fact of exploitation, (2) the economic interpretation of man—and his history, (3) the dialectical process in human development.

The fact of exploitation is fundamental. When Mr G. H. D. Cole says (interpreting Marx), 'The prices of individual commodities are mere appearances; what is real is the one fact of exploitation', the Christian may heartily agree. He can have no quarrel on this issue, seeing that his own book exposed and condemned this very thing more than 2,000 years earlier than Marx. Indeed, the Christian can go much farther, and acknowledge a debt to Marx for having given a renewed and much-needed emphasis to the fact when, in an age of intense industrial development, the evil of exploitation had grown to vast dimensions. Marx did not overstate the case against it. The Christian Church had failed to prevent it or to provide a remedy. Her prophets had spoken against it but the Church as a whole had not heeded them, and many of her own sons had been numbered among the oppressors. The Church must welcome the emphasis on the evil of exploitation; must confess her failure to respond—not to the angry passion of Marx, but to the tender compassion of Christ. Anger may serve a violent revolution; it can never serve a constructive purpose.

*Greater than anger
Is love and subdueth.*

The economic interpretation of history, as expounded by Marx, is not for simple acceptance. That the economic factors conditioning man's life have been underestimated is certain; and for the focusing of world attention upon them we have again to thank Marx. But that is a very different thing from accepting—as Marx would have us—the economic factor as the sole cause of *all* that man is. The Christian will never consent, for instance, that the conversion of St Paul, the Confessions of St Augustine, the imagination of Shakespeare, the poems of Milton, the music of Beethoven, are to be attributed to an economic origin and inspiration. He will rather suggest, with some conviction, that Marx has taken one facet of truth and experience and erected upon it an ideology that fails (as ideologies must) to interpret the unity and wholeness of life. Not by an external process of production (of things) is man's life solely conditioned—much less determined. It is *conditioned* by the environment of his being—physical, mental, spiritual; it is *determined* by his reaction and response to this total environment.

That a *dialectical process* marks the development of human thought and experience may be freely admitted. It should occasion little surprise to an experimental people long schooled to the method of 'trial and error'. But they will refuse—and they will be right to refuse—to be imprisoned within a rigid and automatic interpretation of it. They may welcome the dialectical principle of Hegel, but reject the materialist content put into it by Marx. They will remember that it was the temper and mood of Marx at a critical time in his experience—when he reacted from the decadent idealism of the Bauers to the confident materialism of Feuerbach—that produced his dialectical *materialism*. This mood of Marx is too much to ask us to accept. Incidentally, it is an illustration of the effect of dynamic personality—as against productive process—upon history. Marx himself applied it only to the one triangle—Feudalism, Capitalism, and Communism. It served his purpose. He said it could not skip a stage; in Russia *it did*.

While there is much in the Marxist diagnosis with which there can be no quarrel, there is nothing—literally nothing—in the Marxist remedy with which the Christian can agree. This goes for (1) the class war, (2) the dictatorship of the proletariat, (3) the fading State, yielding to classless society. The Christian can accept none of these, and these together constitute the Marxist remedy.

The class war destroys the unity of mankind; it divides the human family. It is war, and sanctions war on one's fellow-citizens. With a scythe-like movement across the world it cuts through nationhoods, cultures, institutions, and makes war on all who are not identified with one class—one ideology. It is the very antithesis of the Christian spirit of love. Its motives are social negatives—resentment, anger, hatred. These cannot create: they can only destroy. They are worse than the 'opium of the people'; they are deadly social poison.

It may be asked—it ought to be asked—how it comes that those who make the class war the first stage in their remedy have become the propagandists of world peace. The answer is simple. The word 'Peace' is known to have a great appeal to the nations of the West, and a magic influence on our sentimental idealists. Its value for propaganda is immense. But the only peace that is seriously intended is through the victory of the class war, whether that war be cold or hot. After victory

and in 'peace' would come the sifting of the sentimentalists and the liquidation of the deviationists. The class war is no remedy.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is impracticable. The proletariat *en masse* cannot dictate—cannot in detail make known its executive will. Marx himself saw this. 'The broad masses of the working class after years of bondage cannot be expected to be ripe either for self-government, or for the control and liquidation of the forces they have displaced. A party must therefore be formed which shall function as a political, intellectual, and legislative *elite* of the people, enjoying its confidence in virtue of its disinterestedness, its superior training and its practical insight into the needs of the immediate situation, able to guide the people's uncertain steps during the first period of its new freedom. . . . There is no doubt that by 1848 Marx thought of it in terms of a *self-appointed elite* . . . a small body of convinced and ruthless individuals, who were to wield dictatorial power and educate the proletariat until it reached a level at which it comprehended its proper task. . . . This doctrine is familiar to the world because it was adopted by Lenin and was put into practice with the most literal fidelity by him and by Trotsky in Russia in 1917.'⁴⁰

Later, it is true, Marx abandoned—at least in practice—the idea of the *elite*, because of the opposition it would have to face. But Lenin and Trotsky actually carried through what we must see was the Marxist ideal.

So it is not the dictatorship of the proletariat after all, but of a self-appointed oligarchy of determined and ruthless men, who will know better than the masses themselves what is good for them. It is 'the idea of the proletariat' that is exploited to sustain the ruthless dictatorship of these men and, finally, as in previous dictatorships, the rule of one man exalted to the status of a demigod.

But this, it is claimed, is a passing phase. These self-appointed rulers—or the single dictator—will give up their power to the proletariat when it has learned to rule. How long that process will take, and who will decide when it is completed we are not told. Nor are we given any guarantee that the self-appointed rulers will remain for ever 'disinterested'. Meanwhile we see them more and more separated from those they rule, and in every way exalted above them. The power motive may prove a worse devil than the profit motive it has promised to drive out. It may cling more closely. It is more ineluctable. Wealth is more flexible than power; it flows—in general exchange; 'a fool and his money are soon parted'; the process of 'clogs to clogs' is not unknown: above all, it can be taxed for the service of the whole community. None of these things can be said of enthroned power. It is rigid and relentless in its hold; it will not yield, as Marx fondly imagined. Its final answer to opposition is the prison camp; the firing-squad. The only answer to enthroned power is—another revolution!

Even if a genuine dictatorship of the proletariat were practicable and possible, it would still, like every dictatorship, be an evil thing. The dictatorship of any section over the whole can never be conceded in a family of men founded on the Fatherhood of God.

But once more, we find a word borrowed from the West. As 'peace' is claimed for the class war, 'democracy' is made to describe a self-confessed dictatorship. The almost magic appeal of the word in the West is well known, and its value for propaganda. True it is a 'people's' democracy, but since 'people' has long been the exclusive claim of the 'Left', the 'people's democracy' is just the dictatorship

of the proletariat in borrowed clothes; a real, if unwilling, tribute to the West.

The prophesy of the *Fading State* is being everywhere disproved before our eyes—most of all in Russia, the Communist Motherland. There is general agreement with these words of Bertrand Russell: 'In spite of the outcome of the . . . war, it seems evident that the functions of the State must continue to increase.' The very complexity of modern life and industry calls for State direction and discipline, though it be the collective self-discipline of a full self-governing democracy. Marx's vision of a *classless society* of contented economic units without other discipline or control than their economic interests and occupations was a mirage that did not deceive Lenin, who saw 'the obvious primacy of politics' and promptly seized the power of the State. Politics in Russia has 'made hay' of Marx's doctrine of economic supremacy. Russia's politics will determine all else, whoever may determine the politics. The Iron Curtain is not economic; it is not cultural; it is not racial; it is political.

TOM DRING

¹ *Politics*, Book II.

² *Social Morality*, p. 19.

³ *Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy*, I.166-7.

⁴ *E.R.E.*, III.779.

⁵ *ibid.*, p. 785.

⁶ *Proverbs* 42.

⁷ I. Berlin, *Karl Marx*, p. 253.

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 3.

⁹ *ibid.*, p. 128.

¹⁰ Edward Rogers: *A Commentary on Communism*.

¹¹ Quoted by I. Berlin, *op. cit.*, pp. 259-60.

¹² Arnold Toynbee, *Civilization on Trial*, p. 236.

¹³ *Karl Marx*, p. 266.

¹⁴ Quoted by Edward Rogers, *Commentary on Communism*, p. 128. (Italics inserted by present writer.)

¹⁵ *Micah*, 3s-s (Moffatt).

¹⁶ *Micah*, 6s (A.V.)

¹⁷ I. Berlin, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

¹⁸ *ibid.*, p. 193.

¹⁹ *History and Human Relations*, p. 94.

²⁰ 1 John 31s.

²¹ Berdyaev, *The Russian Idea*, p. 8.

²² *Origins of Russian Communism*, p. 1.

²³ *ibid.*, pp. 18-19.

²⁴ *ibid.*, p. 28.

²⁵ *ibid.*, p. 88.

²⁶ *Civilization on Trial*, p. 172.

²⁷ *Lenin*, p. 57.

²⁸ Berdyaev, *Origin of Russian Communism*, p. 196.

²⁹ Published by *Review of World Affairs*. The author, of necessity, remains anonymous.

³⁰ Berdyaev, *Origin of Russian Communism*, p. 151.

³¹ Press Interview: *Newcastle Journal* (August 1947).

³² Fulop-Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

³³ *E.R.E.*, III, 777.

³⁴ *Times Literary Supplement*, Review of Stephen Ousky's *The Way of the Free* (13th June 1952).

³⁵ *ibid.*

³⁶ *Origin of Russian Communism*, pp. 138-9.

³⁷ From BBC Third Programme and *The Listener*.

³⁸ *Origin of Russian Communism*, p. 177.

³⁹ Karl Stern, *Pillar of Fire*, p. 43.

⁴⁰ I. Berlin, *Karl Marx*, in loco.

COMMODORE PERRY (JULY 1853) AND THE AWAKENING OF JAPAN

JULY 1953 marks the centenary of a very important event, the visit of Commodore Perry to Japan. Since then the history of that country and of the whole world has been changed. The mission of this great American was accomplished without bloodshed or the loss of a single life, and that perhaps explains why his achievement has not merited the attention that would have been given to a military victory. But, to quote Cowper's words concerning Kempenfelt,

*His sword was in the sheath,
His fingers held the pen,*

when he brought his mission to a successful consummation.

Before we look more closely at the happenings of July 1853 we must consider the isolation in which Japan had wrapped herself for two centuries. It had been carried to such lengths that it was made illegal to construct ocean-going vessels. Before this period of isolation (1638-1853) there had been contacts with the western world, and it is interesting to recall that these had been associated with Christianity.

St Francis Xavier reached Kagoshima in 1549, and before leaving Japan two years later he had baptized 760 persons. Trade with the Portuguese in the East had begun a little earlier, following a chance incident when a Portuguese ship bound for Macao had been driven by a storm to a Japanese island. More Jesuits followed in the wake of Xavier, and about thirty years later a Christian community of 150,000 was reported. In 1593 some Franciscans arrived from Manila; and about the same time the pilot of a Spanish ship stranded on the coast made the foolish remark (when describing and explaining the vast Spanish conquests) that 'the Catholic king first sent ministers of the Gospel to convert the natives, who afterwards uniting with the captains of his majesty made their work of conquest easier'. This led to a reaction against the Christians and an outbreak of persecution. The arrival of Dutch Protestants complicated a situation already embittered by disputes between Portuguese Jesuits and Spanish Franciscans; and finally it was declared illegal for any Japanese to become Christian. The great martyrdom of Nagasaki took place in 1622 when about 50 Christians were martyred, including a number of foreign priests.

Apart from allowing a small Dutch factory at the island of Deshima (an artificial island at Nagasaki), Japan followed a policy of strict isolation from the early part of the seventeenth century. Suspicion of the political intentions of foreigners, whether merchants or missionaries, no doubt lay behind this attitude. When the Portuguese attempted to reopen the question, the reply (somewhat underlined by the beheading of sixty of their emissaries) was: 'Think no more of us just as if we were no longer in the world.'

One remarkable fact is that when contact with the West was resumed two centuries later, it was found that groups of Christians had maintained their faith and worship through these years.

The long period of isolation could not continue indefinitely, and in the nineteenth century a number of factors brought the problem of Japan before the

nations of the West. There was the question of the whaling industry; ships deploying in the North-West Pacific could not help observing what an advantage it would be if they were able to refuel at Japanese ports. Then again the hostile reception accorded to stranded vessels and sailors was very annoying. The Japanese were apt to repulse every approach even when their own nationals were being returned.

One incident of the early nineteenth century is worth recalling, and once more it shows how the whole development was interlocked with Christianity. In 1834 a number of Japanese were shipwrecked on the coast of Oregon; these were the first ever to reach the United States. They were at first seized by Red Indians, but later the Methodist Mission of Oregon took charge of them, and found they were 'remarkably studious' when given the advantages of its school. In October 1834 these sailors were shipped to England and thence to Macao. It is at this point that Wells Williams (later to be Perry's interpreter) comes into the story. He announced the presence of three Japanese, then staying at Dr Gutzlaff's house, who had been brought from the Columbia river *via* London; they were joined by four others shipwrecked on the coast of China. Two of this group were converted and were described by Williams as 'the firstfruits of the Church of Christ in Japan'. Moreover, this gave Williams the opportunity of learning Japanese. St John's Gospel was translated by one of these Japanese and was printed at Singapore in 1837 or 1838. Thus, sixteen years before Perry's visit the translation of the Bible into Japanese was well under way.¹

As mention has been made of Wells Williams, it will be fitting to make further reference to him at this point, since his journal will be quoted in the succeeding part of our narrative. One usually thinks of him in connexion with China, since his work, *The Middle Kingdom*, was a standard authority on that country for many years. He later occupied the first chair of Chinese at Yale. It was in 1833 that he first came to China as a missionary; and he was concerned in the main with editorial and literary activities. But the meeting with Japanese mentioned above fired his enthusiasm for this new field of missionary enterprise; and when he returned to the United States in 1846 on a visit, he had a type-fount of Japanese cut in New York. He made a great study of Japanese life and thought, laying every possible source under contribution, and wrote many essays on the subject, essays described by Henry F. Graff² as 'a magnificent achievement of incalculable worth'.

All this shows that the time was ripe, both from the political and the missionary point of view, for a definite approach to the mysterious land of the Rising Sun. Who was to knock on this long-closed door? The United States took the initiative, but the diplomatic mission of Biddle in 1846 was a complete failure. A new approach became necessary, and the man who was finally entrusted with this task was Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry.

Of Quaker extraction, Perry was born at S. Kingston, Rhode Island, in 1794. His father had abandoned Quaker pacificism and had donned the uniform of the Kingston Reds. Young Matthew joined the Navy and later saw service in the Mexican War. He was a man of strong character and high principles. According to Barrows, he was 'an earnest student of the Bible'.³ Anyone who examines the portrait in the *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, Vol. 37, would recognize that he was not a man one would trifle with. His features and bearing remind me somehow of Holbein's portrait of Sir Henry Guildford: there are the same dignity

and seriousness. Before setting out on his mission to Japan he made a study of the writings of Kaempfer and Von Siebold, the Dutch authorities on the subject, and 'the only men of scientific training who had actually visited those shores' (Barrows, 216). He had never seen any part of Asia himself, but had on his shelves a number of books about Asiatic life, showing his keen interest in the East. It was therefore with great zest that he prepared for his historic voyage.

His flagship at the outset was the *Mississippi*, and it was in November 1852 that he sailed down Chesapeake Bay. He carried with him a letter from President Fillmore to the Emperor, beginning as follows:

MILLARD FILLMORE, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, TO HIS IMPERIAL MAJESTY, THE EMPEROR OF JAPAN.

Great and good friend: I send you this public letter by Commodore Matthew C. Perry, an officer of the highest rank in the navy of the United States, and commander of the squadron now visiting your imperial majesty's dominion.

An offer of friendship followed; a suggestion of trade between the two countries which would be beneficial to both; a request that when whaling-ships were wrecked on the coast, 'our unfortunate people should be treated with kindness'; a request for facilities for taking in coal, provisions and water. The accompanying presents were specimens of articles manufactured in the United States; 'they are intended as tokens of our sincere and respectful friendship. May the Almighty have your imperial majesty in His great and holy keeping!'

The letter was written on vellum and reposed in a gold and rosewood box. The presents were intended for the Emperor and other Japanese notables, and the list of them as given by Wells Williams⁴ makes interesting reading. The gifts ultimately earmarked for the Emperor included the following:

One quarter-size miniature steam engine, track, tender, and car.
 Telegraph, with three miles of wire and gutta-percha wire.
 Audubon's *Birds*, in nine volumes.
Natural History of the State of New York, sixteen volumes.
Annals of Congress, four volumes.
 Silver-topped dressing-case.
 Eight yards scarlet broadcloth.
 Barrel of whisky.
 Three 10-cent boxes of fine tea.
 Telescope and stand in box.
 Sheet-iron stove.
 Two mail-bags with padlocks.

For the Empress: Flowered silk-embroidered dress; toilet dressing-box gilded; six dozen assorted perfumery, etc. For one prince there were Lossing's *Field Book of Revolution*, ten gallons of whisky, cabinet of *Natural History of New York*, one lithograph, one clock, one revolver, one sword, one rifle, one dozen perfumery; and for another the presents included Appleton's dictionary, a lithograph of New Orleans, and a box of cherry cordial.

Perry's route lay round South Africa, and at Ceylon he had his first glimpse of Asia. From Singapore he sailed to Hong Kong (6th April), where he was joined by other U.S. ships, *Plymouth*, *Saratoga*, and *Supply* (a store ship). His new flag-ship, the *Susquehanna*, was awaiting him at Shanghai. He now had with him Wells Williams as interpreter. A call was made at the Liu Chiu Islands, where the regent came on board; and finally, he began the last stage of his journey. He was in command of four vessels, as the *Supply* had been left at Napa.

It was on 8th July that they drew into Yedo Bay near Uruga; in the distance Fujiyama was plainly visible, and not far away was Yokohama, at this time an obscure fishing-village. Yedo, after which the bay was named, lay some miles to the north. Now known as Tokyo, it was at that time the residence of the Shogun, who was virtually ruler of the country. The Emperor himself was at Kyoto, which he never left. The position was similar to that which obtained a thousand years earlier among the Franks, the mayor of the palace corresponding to the Shogun, who was known as the Lord of the Forbidden Interior. It seems that in the sequel the Americans believed they were negotiating with the Emperor, while, strictly speaking, it was the Shogun; the latter was the key man of the nation, but the ambiguous position led to certain complications a few years later.

As the four vessels drew into line parallel with the beach, their presence excited great attention; and the noise made by the simultaneous release of the anchors produced consternation among the Japanese both on shore and in multitudes of small boats clustering around. At a blast from the *Plymouth's* whistle, the entire crew of one Japanese boat dived overboard! Japanese guard-boats then surrounded the *Susquehanna*, Perry's flagship, which cleared its decks for action. It was a critical moment. Just in time a voice from the Japanese side shouted: 'I can speak Dutch.' This opening made conversation possible, and the stranger revealed that the Vice-Governor of Uruga, Saboroske, was on board. He was not allowed to meet Perry; it was explained that the latter also was a Lord of the Forbidden Interior, and could only be seen by one of exalted rank. But as a compromise, Lieut. Contee, the Commodore's aide, was deputed to receive the Vice-Governor on board, together with his Dutch-speaking interpreter. This strict observance of 'caste' proved to be a wise move. As Barrows points out, the Americans had ended for ever the insolence with which foreign emissaries had been received. 'One can imagine the vast sigh of relief that must have swept over the deck when the Japanese stepped aboard, and the taut-nerved ship's company realized that a fight to the death had been evaded for one day at least.'

As a result of an arrangement made with the Vice-Governor, his superior, the Governor of Uruga, named Yezaimon, came on board the following day, Saturday, 9th July. He asked that the President's letter should be taken to Nagasaki, the only place possible for any contact with foreigners. The Americans refused. They indicated the magnificent box in which the letter was housed, and according to Barrows, Yezaimon's manner changed at the sight; these strangers at least knew the fitting way to deal with a Son of Heaven. Wells Williams, however (who after all was there), says that the Japanese showed little or no admiration at the gold and rosewood container. Finally, a copy of the letter was taken by the Governor for submission to the highest authority at Yedo, and a few days were left for awaiting direction.

On Sunday, 10th July, the crowds of Japanese observers were startled to see 300

sailors in Sunday dress on the decks of the *Susquehanna* assembled for Christian worship. Chaplain Jones conducted the service, and Yedo Bay resounded with the hymn:

*Before Jehovah's awful throne
Ye nations, bow with sacred joy.*

There is nothing of importance to record for 11th July; but on the following day Yezaimon, the Governor of Uruga, made a fresh attempt to divert Perry to Nagasaki. He also pointed out that only a copy of the President's letter had been handed over, and asked for the original. Perry made it perfectly plain that on no account would he transfer his ships to Nagasaki, and he insisted on delivering the letter in person on the shores of Yedo Bay to a court official corresponding in rank to the President, and holding imperial credentials. Yezaimon accordingly returned the next day (13th) with a definite proposal that Perry should land on the 14th to meet the imperial emissary.

The Commodore's patience and persistence were thus rewarded, and so we come to Thursday, 14th July, the day of the actual landing. During the previous night sounds from the shore indicated that extensive preparations were being made, and morning light revealed a pavilion or marquee and various kinds of coloured decorations. There were also some thousands of Japanese soldiers. The actual spot of the landing was Kurihama, and the manner in which it was carried out is thus described in the journal of Wells Williams:

As soon as Commodore Perry landed all fell into procession; Capt. Buchanan, who was the first man ashore, had arranged all in their places so that no hindrance took place. The marines, headed by Major Zeilen, led off, he going ahead with a drawn sword; then half of the sailors with one band playing between the two parties. Two tall blacks heavily armed supported by as tall a standard-bearer, carrying a commodore's pennant, went next before two boys carrying the President's letter and the Full Powers in their boxes covered with red baize. The Commodore, supported by Capt. Adams and Lt. Contee, each wearing chapeaux, then advanced; the interpreters and secretary came next succeeded by Capt. Buchanan and the gay-appearing file of officers whose epaulettes, buttons, etc., shone brightly in the sun. A file of sailors and the band, with marines under Capt. Slack, finished this remarkable escort. The escort of Von Resanoff at Nagasaki of seven men was denied a landing until they had been stripped of almost everything belonging to a guard of honour; here, 50 years after, a strongly-armed escort of 300 Americans do honour to their President's letter at the other end of the empire, the Japanese being anxious only to know the size and arrangement of what they feel themselves powerless to resist. There were fully a thousand charges of ball in the escort besides the contents of the cartridge boxes. Any treachery on their part would have met a serious revenge.

The two Japanese envoys were Toda, prince of Idzu, and Ido, prince of Iwame. They rose as the Commodore entered the pavilion and the two parties made slight bows to each other. They were not long together and little took place beyond an exchange of notes and a very brief conversation through interpreters. The President's letter was delivered to the envoys in its sumptuous box, and the Commodore was given a receipt for it in Dutch and Japanese, worded as follows:

According to Japanese law it is illegal for any paper to be received from foreign countries except at Nagasaki, but as the Commodore has taken much trouble to bring the letter

of the President here, it is notwithstanding received. No conversation can be allowed, and as soon as the documents and the copy are handed over you will leave.

The final understanding reached was that an interval should be left for the Japanese to study the President's letter and to prepare their reply; Perry would return to China for the time, and would come back to Yedo Bay in the spring of 1854.

When the American party returned to the ship, it was not long before Yezaimon came on board and asked them to leave the bay forthwith. Perry, however, said they would go in about four days' time after finding better anchorage for his ships next year. He had indicated that he would be returning with a larger fleet. Several other Japanese came on board then, and on subsequent days, and showed great interest in the equipment of the *Susquehanna* and the other vessels. Williams closes his journal note for 14th July:

At eventide we were left alone and thus closed this eventful day, one which will be a day to be noted in the history of Japan, one on which the key was put into the lock and a beginning made to do away with the long seclusion of this nation, for I incline to think that the reception of such a letter in such a public manner involves its consideration if not its acceptance; at least the prestige of determined seclusion on her part is gone after the meeting at Kurihama.

It is interesting to compare with Williams's account the journals or diaries kept by Lewis and Allen, and printed in the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, Volumes 54 and 55 (1950-51): 'Bluejackets with Perry in Japan. A day-by-day account kept by Master's Mate John R. C. Lewis and Cabin Boy William B. Allen, edited by Henry F. Graff.' As, however, these were with Perry on his return visit to Japan in 1854, and not in 1853, their records are not of great service for our immediate purpose, which is to throw the spotlight on the events of that momentous week in July when the Commodore made his first landing. But at one point they make contact with our present survey. During July 1853 the *Macedonia*, with Lewis on board, and the *Vandalia*, with Allen, were on their way to the agreed rendezvous, the Liu Chiu Islands, which Perry had touched earlier as noted above. But on 2nd August, before they had reached these islands, they met Perry on his way back from Yedo Bay. Allen's diary for that day, written on board the *Vandalia*, describes how they met the *Mississippi* and the *Susquehanna*, and continues:

Our captain went aboard the Commodore ship with late Papers and letters from home. Commodore Perry informed him that he was just returning from Japan where on the 14th of July he had landed with a Body Guard of 200 seamen and marines delivering the proposed dispatches from the President of the U.S. to the second in command to the emperor and giving them six months to consider on them. The natives were inclined to be hostile, not knowing the meaning of an armed fleet entering their hitherto sequestered waters, but upon the nature of the errand being made known, they made no opposition to the American landing, but appeared anxious that the vessels should leave as soon as possible. The Commodore gave Captain Pope orders to return with the *Vandalia* to Hong Kong until such times as the whole squadron were collected and at 8 p.m. we put the ship about and stood back for China.

One observes that Williams's journal for 2nd August just dovetails into Allen's account:

This evening, to the gratification of everyone, we met the *Vandalia* on her way to Napa,

and obtained letters from her, among which I was happy to find one for me informing me that all at Macao and Canton were in good health a week ago. It is something of an event for three U.S. men-of-war to meet in these unfrequented seas.

During the remaining months of 1853, there was great perturbation and searching of heart in Japan. The ban against constructing ocean-going vessels was lifted. But the paramount question was: Are we to accede to the suggestions made in President Fillmore's letter, or are we to repulse this insistent approach and use this interim period for strengthening our defences? At first the latter course seemed to commend itself, but there were influential leaders here and there in Japan who felt that a continuance of the exclusion policy was impossible. In the midst of this ferment the Shogun died. He had called together the Ronins (the governing nobles) and these feudal chiefs agreed to build and arm large vessels, and to assemble military forces. The death of the Shogun was regarded as an indication that he had angered the gods by permitting the Americans to land. The help of the Dutch at Deshima was enlisted and they were asked to prepare a man-of-war.

Gradually, however, it dawned upon them that this kind of resistance was hopeless. A medieval Japan could not stand up to a modern America. And so on 2nd December instructions were issued that if Perry returned he was to be given a friendly reception. A University professor of high rank, Hayashi, was appointed as commissioner to negotiate the treaty, which seemed unavoidable.

Meanwhile, Perry was preparing his return visit and in the February of 1854 he approached Yedo Bay once more with ten ships and 2,000 men. It is not our purpose to dwell in detail upon the happenings of this second visit. It must suffice to mention that the main suggestions of the American letter were agreed to. Two ports were to be opened to American ships, Simoda and Hakodate, and they were to be allowed to secure supplies there. When American ships were driven ashore on the coast of Japan, Japanese vessels would assist them and the stranded crews would be properly cared for at one of the two treaty ports. It was agreed too 'that shipwrecked and other American citizens in Japan should be free as in other countries, within certain prescribed limits, that ships of the U.S. should be permitted to trade at the two treaty ports under temporary regulations prescribed by the Japanese, and that privileges granted to other nations thereafter must also be extended to the U.S.'.⁴ Moreover, the two nations pledged themselves to permanent peace, and 'a sincere and cordial amity'. It was on this second visit that the presents mentioned earlier were made over. Typically Oriental gifts were passed to the Americans, brocades and silks, porcelains, lacquer boxes, and trays, and so on. Perry remained in Japan until June, having brought to a successful end the responsible task entrusted to him. The last entry in Wells Williams's account is: 'Thus ends my expedition to Japan, for which praise be to God.'

One complication which soon arose was the awakening of the Mikado from his long lethargy in Kyoto. The Shogun at Yedo, he affirmed, had no right to conclude a treaty or admit barbarians to the sacred soil of Japan. As Robinson and Beard point out, 'supposing that the Shogun was the ruler of Japan,' Perry had 'presented his demands to him'.⁵ Thus for a time the agreement made with the Shogun and his council was ignored by the Emperor and those who rallied around him. Foreigners were attacked in the Emperor's name, and one unfortunate result was that the English took reprisals by bombarding Kagoshima, the stronghold of

the Satsuma clan in 1862, and Shimonoseki in the following year. 'The effect produced by these bombardments was wonderful.' The Emperor and his party saw that the exclusion policy was utterly impracticable. A new Mikado, Mutsuhito, inaugurated the famous Meiji era in January 1867, and a few months later the Shogun resigned. This was Iyesada, whose father Eyeyoshi had died in 1853; Iyesada was the last of the Shoguns, and his resignation sounded the death-knell of medieval Japan.

The Mikado moved his capital from Kyoto to Yedo, which now received the new name Tokyo (northern capital). It is common knowledge how the whole life and outlook of the nation were completely refashioned in an incredibly short space of time. Japanese students were sent all over the world to absorb as rapidly as possible new ways of social, industrial and political life; and within a single generation Japan was in the main stream of world affairs, thanks to a brilliant company of enlightened and patriotic counsellors.

The most important result of all was that a new field was now open to the Gospel of Christ, and though the Japanese Christian Church is not numerically strong, such men as Nitobe and Kagawa show that Christianity has taken firm root among this remarkable and versatile race.

Perry died in 1858, within a few years of his visit; but he surely looked back with satisfaction on a mission which has changed the whole destiny of the Orient.

T. FRANCIS GLASSON

¹ The first portion of the Bible actually published in Japan itself was St Matthew, translated by Jonathan Gable (who sailed with Perry and is said to have invented the jinriksha); it was printed from wooden blocks.

² *Bulletin of New York Public Library*, Vol. 54 (1950), p. 441.

³ *The Great Commodore*. The exploits of Matthew Calbraith Perry. By Edward M. Barrows. (Bobbs-Merrill Co., Indianapolis and New York, 1935.)

⁴ S. Wells Williams: *A Journal of the Perry Expedition to Japan 1853-54*, edited by his son, 1910. Included in *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, Vol. 37, Part 2, printed at Yokohama. There is an amusing Japanese coloured print of Williams brandishing a cigarette at the beginning of the *Journal*.

⁵ *Encyclopedia Britannica*; article on Perry. Vol. XVII.544.

⁶ *Development of Modern Europe*, II.340, by J. H. Robinson and C. A. Beard. (Ginn and Co., Boston, 1918.)

⁷ *Encyclopedia Britannica*; article on Japan. Vol. XII.945.

THE CHALLENGE OF NIETZSCHE

FOR most people in this country the discovery of Nietzsche came in August 1914. War had been declared only a few weeks when he was equated with Treitschke and Bernhardi as one of the fathers of German militarism. It was easy to quote from his writings in support of this thesis. Did he not say, for example, that 'a just war halloweth every cause'? True, there were those who warned us against taking him so literally and who pointed out that he had his devotees in France and Italy as well as in Germany. But their apology for Nietzsche seemed once for all refuted when Mussolini openly acknowledged him as one of the sources of his inspiration, and Hitler consented to establish a connexion between the ideology of his régime and the ideas of the philosopher. Further reflection, however, suggests that Nietzsche was appropriated by Fascism and National Socialism against his own will, and recent research has given good reason to suppose that it was his sister, Frau Förster-Nietzsche, who thus betrayed him after death. She constituted herself his literary executor, and she must be held responsible for an interpretation of her brother's writings that has since become more and more questionable.

A new Nietzsche now begins to emerge, in many respects a striking contrast to the figure with which we have so long been content. He is a good European instead of a Prussian, an intense admirer of the Old Testament and the Jews instead of an anti-Semite, a moralist instead of a preacher of licence. The will-to-power and the Superman are to be read as symbols, when he speaks of breeding he means this in a cultural and not at all a biological sense, and his master-race is not a superior people, but the select company of great individuals who join hands across the ages and open their ranks for others to join them in the future. One contribution to this reinterpretation of Nietzsche has come from a Roman Catholic scholar, Father Copleston, but the most important and comprehensive work to date on the subject hails from across the Atlantic. It is Walter A. Kaufmann's *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist*. Kaufmann supports his thesis by setting aside the English translations and appealing from the editorial work of the philosopher's sister to what he himself wrote. It may well be that his rehabilitation of Nietzsche has erred on the side of generosity, so that one feels at times that the evidence is being strained. Nevertheless—and this is the point with which I am here concerned—the new Nietzsche to whom we now have access constitutes a challenge to us as Christians that is more worthy of attention and reply than ever the old one was.

Before entering upon this, it may be of value to call attention, as others have done, to the similarity in certain respects between Nietzsche and Kierkegaard. Each of them was in sharp conflict with his time and each of them came to an untimely and unhappy end. Each has fructified subsequent philosophical thinking without himself being a philosopher by profession. But far more importantly, the Dane and the German were at one in their opposition to the Christianity of their day, a middle-class and comfortable Christianity, as it seemed to them, that had come about by a denial of Christ and a compromise with the world. Nietzsche said: 'There was only one Christian, and he died on the Cross,' and Kierkegaard would have agreed with him. They called men to reject the nominal Christianity of the nineteenth century as a religion all professed but none in fact believed.

There, however, they parted, for while Kierkegaard bade men return to a radical and uncompromising Christianity, Nietzsche would have them abandon any form of Christianity for naturalism.

I

Nowhere, perhaps, does Nietzsche's method, his use of symbol and parable and his delight in the extreme statement that teaches because it has first shocked, display itself more clearly than in the slogan: 'God is dead!' He describes a madman who runs into the market-place at noon, lamp in hand, looking for God. 'Where is God gone?' he called out. 'I mean to tell you! *We have killed him*—you and I! We are all his murderers!' The madman then goes on to describe the desolation that follows on the passing of God. 'Is there still an above and a below? Do we not stray, as through infinite nothingness? Does not empty space breathe upon us? Has it not become colder? Does not night come on continually, darker and darker?'¹ In plain language, with the passing of a belief in God, our civilization has lost all its standards. There is no longer an eternal background to our life, we are homeless wanderers in the universe, lost and astray where we were once at home.

It is easy to understand what is meant by saying that God is dead. It is poetic language for the widespread loss of any effective faith in God as a factor in human life. But God is not merely dead according to Nietzsche. What heightens the tragedy is that we have killed him. In other words, the loss of faith in God—I use that expression deliberately, for one should be careful how one accuses Nietzsche of atheism in any strict and dogmatic sense—the loss of faith in God is the result of the extension of human knowledge, particularly through the natural sciences. They have given us an explanation of the world that leaves no room for God, we have banished Him by learning how to dispense with the services He rendered to previous generations. For Nietzsche, that is to say, the theistic hypothesis has been proved invalid, but its passing has exposed mankind to the direst peril it has ever had to face. The old landmarks and securities have gone, the old values have lost their sanction, henceforth he devotes himself to that transvaluation of all values out of which a new guidance for mankind may one day arise.

Nietzsche therefore must be included among those who, whether by affirming Him or denying Him, agree that the question of God is the crucial one for the individual and for society. He accepted Darwin's conclusions as to the origin of the human race, while questioning some of his arguments. Darwin was among the murderers of God, and in so doing he had dealt man a mortal blow. Henceforth, so Nietzsche would say, we must cease to think of man as an immortal soul created in God's image and watch him sink back among the animals. Science has devalued man. And what is likely to be the outcome of this? In a world without God and a humanity no longer distinct from the beasts that perish, what horrors may we not expect! 'If the doctrines of sovereign Becoming, of the liquidity of all . . . species, of the lack of any cardinal distinction between man and animal—doctrines which I consider true but deadly—are hurled into the people for another generation . . . then nobody should be surprised when . . . brotherhoods with the aim of robbery and exploitation of the non-brothers . . . will appear on the arena of the future.'² Prophetic words! One catches a glimpse of the agony in a man's

soul as he wrestles with what is 'true but deadly'. Have we not reason to be grateful to Nietzsche for showing us so clearly whither naturalism leads?

II

The new knowledge of Nietzsche enables us to understand and assess better his opposition to Christian ethics. He criticizes Christian moral standards in the light of his own standard, which is that of the will-to-power. But, as was indicated earlier, the will-to-power must be taken symbolically and not literally. It is no idealization of the ruthless ambition and self-assertion by which the few make themselves masters of the many and exploit them. The ethic to which the conception gives rise is one of self-overcoming. The warfare of which Nietzsche speaks in such questionable terms is directed against oneself, not for the suppression of impulse but for its utilization. The word 'sublimation' perhaps expresses best what is in his mind. The ideal man is one who has strong impulses but is able to bring them under control and so to order them as to give style and character to his life. Probably Socrates in the ancient world, and Goethe in the modern, are those who come nearest to this ideal. The only virtue that Nietzsche recognizes, one may say, is that of the man who could be vicious; he will do the right by employing and not by suppressing the strong and assertive aspects of his being.

In other words, goodness, if it is to be genuine, must be the expression of strength, and not of weakness. The humility of the man who is incapable of being tempted to pride is as worthless as the chastity of the man whose sex-impulse has not yet awakened. One is reminded of the rabbinic maxim: 'Thou shalt serve God with the good impulse, and with the evil impulse.' Nietzsche's criticism of Christianity is that, unlike the Old Testament with its heroic figures, it teaches a morality based on weakness. Paul, he avers, was the man with whom this corruption set in. Nurtured in Pharisaism, he despaired of justification by works and turned to faith instead. He preached submission, asceticism, and reliance upon the merits of Another. The ethic he created is that of men who are humble because they do not dare to be proud, pure because they are afraid and ashamed of their impulses. As he opposed faith to works, so he denied reason for its sake. Tertullian's *Credo quia absurdum*, Nietzsche would say, is the typical Christian attitude, and unfortunately in this Kierkegaard would have agreed with him.

We may grant at once that this is not a description of the Christian ethic, but a grossly unfair caricature of it. Nietzsche has wholly failed to understand the spiritual experience of Paul and Luther or what it is that has made Protestantism, just because of its reliance on grace, potent in works. But do we not need to be on our guard against so presenting Christian morality as to suggest weakness rather than strength, flight before temptation rather than mastery over it? For example, the Christian requirement of chastity before marriage is ill defended so long as stress is laid on the fear of discovery with attendant social disapproval; we should urge instead that marriage is a sacred enterprise to which both man and woman need to come as dedicated persons who have kept themselves unspoiled for it. Again, the Christian pacifist gains only poor recruits while he dwells on the horrors of a third world war; he needs to take up the military virtues into the better way he offers. Finally, Christian humility must not be confused with

self-depreciation or evasion of responsibility; it consists rather in the refusal to think about oneself at all, so absorbed is one in God and His service.

III

Having granted this much value in Nietzsche's criticism of Christian morality, we go on to ask what he himself would substitute therefor. As has been indicated already, his ethic is one of self-realization. The goal of man is his individual perfection. This follows on the dreadful discovery that man has lost the dignity he was once thought to possess, that he has been demoted from a position a little lower than the angels to one on a level with the animals. The vast majority of men, so Nietzsche would say, are content to remain in that condition. But some few have raised themselves above this sorry level, and have become higher men, men indeed, and no longer merely specimens of the animal world. They have done this by self-discipline and constant effort after the highest, by deliberate self-cultivation they have raised the pyramid of their being above the flat monotonous expanse of the great mass of mankind. Such individuals, the Supermen, provide the sole justification for the race out of which they arise: it is worth while for it to have been because it has produced them. And they in turn were justified in scorning it and living for their own perfection, since one of them is worth more than a multitude of common men.

It is important to recognize that there is no glorification here of any particular race or nation. The Supermen are a succession of individuals who have appeared in the past and whom it should be our aim to reproduce. The great commandment is: 'Surpass thyself! Strive ever to make what thou art today a means to something worthier thou shalt be tomorrow!' We do not do justice to Nietzsche unless we allow to him this role of moralist and teacher. He has not a little in common with Socrates whom he admired so much. He has something in common, too, with Kierkegaard, since the Dane is as avowed and radical an individualist as the German. Where they differ is that Kierkegaard never shared the contempt for the mass of mankind that is so regrettable in Nietzsche. For him, every man is meant by God to reach the highest, and the individual who, as was the case with himself, finds that he is not allowed to share the common lot, must not sunder himself from his fellows in pride on that account, but must the more bind himself to them in sympathy. Nietzsche's individual is self-made, while Kierkegaard's is always conscious that he is before God.

Neither of these men, to be sure, had any appreciation of the Christian ethic of fellowship and community. That is understandable in Nietzsche, for whom the whole notion of service and self-sacrifice was alien. His ethic of self-overcoming and self-perfecting is not original, of course, it is at least as old as Buddha and the Stoics. Its basic error is that it knows only one dimension of the self, it is blind—at least in Nietzsche's case—to the self's relation to other selves and to God. Self-perfection is not to be sought directly; that would be only a refined form of selfishness. It comes unsought to him who loses himself in the service of God and his fellows. It is quite true, as Nietzsche urged, that we cannot give to others unless we have something in ourselves to give. But it is equally true that we only find self-fulfilment in community, and also in reverence before God. Rightly understood, there is a healthy objectivity about the Christian ethic that compares

favourably with the Nietzschean. For is not the latter suggestive of the cultivation of one or two priceless orchids while everything else is left to rot and die?

IV

I turn in conclusion to Nietzsche's atheism and its significance for us. The starting-point of philosophy was for him doubt, and that of a much more radical and far-reaching kind than Descartes ever envisaged. The latter only doubted as an intellectual experiment, while the actual conduct of life continued to be governed by the accepted beliefs and standards of the time. He was not personally involved in his doubt, he did not stand, as Nietzsche was to do, on the brink of an abyss and see himself about to hurtle downwards. For Nietzsche made the experiment of doubting everything, God and moral standards included, and finding whether anything remained that could not be doubted. And he made the discovery that radical, existential doubt of this character, doubt that takes itself in deadly earnest, is only possible when one is driven to it by a passion for truth. The presupposition of doubt is therefore faith in absolute truth, truth that a man does not make but simply finds. The slightest degree of insincerity makes doubt relative and partial, only the utterly sincere man can doubt utterly. And what is sincerity but a tireless quest for truth?

*It fortifies my soul to know
That, though I perish, Truth is so.*

But whence does this sincerity, this passion for truth, arise? It is part of our Christian heritage, that which we retain of Christianity even when we have ceased to be Christians. Science, Nietzsche affirms, requires an openness of mind for which all current opinions are called in question. 'Only, it remains to be asked, whether, in order that this discipline may commence, it is not necessary that there should already be a conviction, and in fact one so imperative and absolute, that it makes a sacrifice of all other convictions. . . . The question whether truth is necessary must not merely be affirmed beforehand, but must be affirmed to such an extent that the principle, belief, or conviction finds expression that "there is nothing more necessary than truth, and in comparison with it everything else has only a secondary value". . . . What I have in view will now be understood, namely, that it is always a metaphysical belief on which our belief in science rests—and that even we knowing ones of today, the godless and anti-metaphysical, still take our fire from the conflagration kindled by a belief a millenium old, the Christian belief, which was also the belief of Plato, that God is truth, that the truth is divine.'

A contemporary thinker has examined the traditional arguments for God's existence and found, as others have found before him, that they do not of themselves carry conviction, however valuable they may be as symbols and expressions of a faith already held on other grounds. He adds: 'It may be permissible to make the paradoxical statement that the real proof of God is the agonized attempt to deny God.'⁴ Is not Nietzsche an instance of this? He spoke in one of his poems of the unknown God after whom he aspired and without whom he could not be content. Was his atheism not perhaps an expression of his dissatisfaction with every idea of God known to him? As Frank continues: 'The atheist may feel the inadequacy of all human concepts of God compared with that which God would really be, the

(continued on page 214)

THE MOUNT OF OLIVES

ALFRED DE VIGNY (1797-1863), one of the greater poets of France, was not afraid to examine the deepest problems of life. He was a solitary thinker who did not conform to prevailing ideas but tried to find his own way.

In *Le Mont des Oliviers*, written not long before his death, he expressed his bewilderment at the contradictions in a world created by God and, with the lips of Jesus in the garden of Gethsemane, asks for an explanation of the many difficulties which baffle his thought.

In the epilogue he has left us a cry of defiant despair which reveals his own failure to reach his virile intellectual aim; yet the whole poem shows a strong desire for *La Certitude heureuse et l'Espoir confiant*.

I

*The night had come and Jesus walked alone, head bowed,
Clad in white raiment like a dead man in his shroud;
While His disciples lay asleep below the hill.
A wind blows through the olive-trees foreboding ill.
Jesus walks in long strides and like them shuddering,
Sad unto death, His eyes sombre and suffering,
His brow was bent, both arms were folded on His gown
As when thieves try to hide their booty in a town;
Knowing the rocky tracks better than smooth highways
He comes to a garden, Gethsemane, and stays.
He bends, kneels down and, with His forehead on the ground,
Cries 'Father', looking upward to the sky around.
—But the sky remains black and God does not reply,
He stands up in surprise and with great strides goes by,
Brushing the olive-trees which tremble; cold and slow
Great drops of bloody sweat from His head drip below.
He draws back, He walks down and cries out with affright:
'Could you not pray and watch with me one hour tonight?'
But, sunk in deathlike sleep, His followers no ward
Can keep, like others Peter does not hear his Lord.
The Son of Man then slowly climbs the hill again,
And scans the sky as when Egyptian shepherds strain
To seek if through some star an angel can be seen.
But a funereal cloud spreads out like the dark screen
Which veils a widow, and its folds on the earth fall.
Jesus became a man, as He remembered all
He suffered three-and-thirty years and His heart failed
When in his mortal struggle human fears prevailed.
He shivered and in vain three times to God He cried:
'Father'; but to His voice the wind alone replied.
He sank down on the dust and sitting there distraught
About the world and man conceived a human thought.
—And the earth trembled when it felt the Saviour's weight
Who at the feet of the Creator fell prostrate.*

II

*Jesus said: 'O Father, permit me yet to live!
 Before my book is closed let me its last word give!
 Do you not feel the world suffer, and all mankind
 Through my flesh shuddering and in your grip confined?
 The earth dreads to be left alone, widowed in youth,
 When the Redeemer dies who speaks new words of truth;
 The only seed allowed in her dried womb to rest
 Was one word sent from heaven and by my lips expressed,
 But that word is so pure, so sweet, so full of grace,
 That its message of hope has fired the human race
 With a desire for God and for eternal life,
 When, opening my arms, I said: "Friends, cease your strife."*

*'Father, Oh! if I have fulfilled my painful task,
 If I have hidden God behind a Sage's mask,
 If I of human offering have changed the price,
 Choosing not bodies but the spirit's sacrifice,
 Receiving everywhere symbols instead of things,
 Accepting speech for fight, obols for costly rings,
 The crimson flow of wine in place of red bloodshed,
 Instead of fleshly limbs the white unleavened bread;
 If I divided time into two parts, one slave
 The other free; to purify the Past I gave
 The blood which soon must flow from my poor dying frame:
 Let us use half of it to cleanse the future shame!
 Father Deliverer! this very day dispense
 Beforehand half this blood of love and innocence
 Upon the heads of those who come to us and say:
 "To save all it is right the innocent to slay."
 We know there will arise in the distant ages
 Hard tyrants guided by a troop of false sages,
 Who will confuse the mind of every nation
 By giving wrong meanings to my redemption.
 —Alas! already while I speak it my own word
 In every parable is made a poisoned sword;
 Remove from me this unclean cup, more bitter far
 Than absinth or than gall or salt sea-waters are.
 The rods, the crown of thorns, all else that may betide,
 The nails to pierce my hands, the lance thrust in my side,
 The very Cross which stands awaiting me to go,
 Have nothing, Father, Oh! nothing that frights me so!
 When Gods choose to descend upon the worlds below,
 The marks they leave behind should deep impressions show,
 If I have set my foot on this imperfect earth
 Whose groans of ceaseless misery called for my birth,
 It was that I might leave two angels in my place,*

*Whose steps would be revered by all the human race,
Rejoicing Confidence and Trusting Hopefulness,
Who walk in Paradise radiant with happiness.
But I have now to leave earth in its poverty
When I have barely raised that cloak of misery
Whose dismal folds drop all around their fatal pall,
While Doubt and Evil hold the ends, depressing all.
Evil and Doubt! with one word I can make them dust;
You had foreseen them, but in your goodwill I trust,
They were not in your plan—That grievous charge is laid
On every side and weighs upon the world you made!
Let Lazarus arise and on his empty tomb
Explain without reserve the dead's mysterious doom,
Let him remember all the things that he has seen
And tell:—What will endure and what will soon have been,
The powers which God has placed within Nature's great heart
And what she takes from all and gives to every part,
What is her silent conversation with the skies,
Her love that cannot be declared, her holy ties,
How all things in her die and all her wounds are healed,
Why some things are obscured and others are revealed;
Whether the stars in heaven are tested one by one,
And, like this earth, found guilty and are then re-won;
If the earth is for them or they for earth are trained;
How fable can be true and mystery explained;
How little wisdom knows, how false is our reason,
And why our soul is bound within its weak prison;
And why there is no path between two broad highways,
Between the weariness of calm and peaceful days
And the unending rage of untamed passions,
Between lethargic ease and tense convulsions;
And why Death over all like a dark sword is set,
Depressing Nature's life by his perpetual threat;—
If Justice and the Good, if Injustice and Ill
Are trivial accidents of a relentless will,
Or if of the created world they are the crest,
On whose gigantic base the Earth and Heaven rest;
And why the evil spirits raise their boastful cry
Exulting over innocence when children die;
—And if the Peoples are women divinely led
By golden stars of thought through which God's light is shed,
Or foolish children with no lamps, lost in the night,
Weeping, colliding and without a guiding light;
—And if, when through time's fragile glass the sand has passed,
Counting the ages grain by grain until the last,
Of your eyes just a look, of your voice just a cry,
Of my cross just a sign, of my heart just a sigh,
Can ease the eternal penalties the Furies bring,*

*Making them loose their human prey and spread their wing:
—All things will be made clear as soon as man shall know
From what place he has come and whither he will go.*

III

*These words the Son of God to God the Father speaks,
He bends to earth again, He waits, He hopes, He seeks—
But He abandons hope and says: 'Father, your will
Be done, not mine; to all eternity fulfil
Your plan!' Deep terror and an anguish infinite
Redouble His torment throughout the long-drawn night.
He looks and looks again but no reply comes back,
Like a funereal stone the whole sky remains black;
The Earth was without light, without star, without morn,
Its soul still dwells in darkness as when it was born;
It shuddered.—In the wood He heard some footsteps sound,
And then He saw the torch of Judas prowling round.*

SILENCE

*If the story be true that in Gethsemane
The Son of Man said words which our Scriptures contain,
If silent, blind and deaf to the world's agony,
Heaven left us, cast aside like a world made in vain,
The just man will oppose scorn to indifference;
His only answer then will be a cold silence
To the eternal silence of God's sovereign reign.*

J. A. LAINÉ

(continued from page 210)

author of all things, even of the atheist.' Whether that was the case with Nietzsche we do not know. But we count him as one of those who witness to God as He who cannot be denied, because the very effort to deny Him involves in the end the affirmation of Him.

E. L. ALLEN

¹ *The Joyful Wisdom*, 125.² Quoted in *Kaufmann*, p. 141.³ *The Joyful Wisdom*, 344.⁴ Erich Frank, *Philosophical Understanding and Religious Truth*, p. 43.

Notes and Discussions

A PHILOSOPHY OF HEALING

Miraculous Cures and the Nature of Health

WIDELY praised by doctors and laymen, a remarkable book by the Methodist minister of the City Temple Church in London¹ has fairly confronted both the Churches and the medical profession with a subject which both have too long neglected or treated with disdain and even contempt—the healing of the sick by non-medical means. Dr Weatherhead writes from twenty-five years personal experience of healing and of co-operation with healers, doctors, and psychologists, in running a psychological clinic attached to his churches in Leeds and London; and he argues his case so cogently, moderately, and with such attention to documentation and case histories, that it will no more be possible for those interested in healing the sick to avoid the challenge of what are popularly described as 'miraculous' cures.

The present writer's debt to Dr Weatherhead in the following article will be obvious to anyone who has read his book. But the writer has added something from his own experience of seven years of more or less serious illness, during which he has received great assistance from orthodox medicine and from healers of various methods.

Dr Alexis Carrel wrote of the cures effected at Lourdes: 'Miraculous cures seldom occur . . . (But those that do) are stubborn irreducible facts, which must be taken into account.' Any other approach would be thoroughly unscientific. Equally, it is well for the healer to remind himself that 'miracles' are not confined to non-medical healing and that they may be (and frequently are) achieved through the medium of drugs or surgery. Anything less than a mind completely open to all the possibilities will inevitably obscure the real issues with prejudice or partisan pre-judgement.

There is another approach which is undesirable. When an American evangelist recently toured South Africa holding healing-services, it was claimed on his behalf that 'the story of this prophet's life—the miraculous cures he worked—indeed witnesses to the fact that Bible days are here again'. We shall later have something to say about these healing-missions. But it is necessary to insist now that, unusual as it obviously is, the gift of healing is by no means unique. Many instances of its use both in history and in the contemporary world are cited in Dr. Weatherhead's book. I myself have personal knowledge of six healers working in the neighbourhood of Johannesburg and Pretoria, all of whom have effected what appear to be miraculous cures; and although (as probably in the case of the American evangelist not all these cures are what they seem and some are not maintained after the initial impact of the healer has subsided, I do not doubt at all that some were genuine, permanent, and (as yet) scientifically inexplicable.

But Dr Weatherhead, a most sincere and temperate Christian, gives reasons for regarding the healing miracles of Jesus as unique in historical experience and offers us his explanation of how and why the early Church gradually lost that unique power. It seems, therefore, to the present writer that it is emotionally unhealthy

and philosophically and psychologically unsound for others to make pretentious claims on the basis of an unusual but not altogether rare gift; and that, moreover, extravagant language in the absence of the most complete scientific diagnosis and follow-up will only alienate many from an approach to illness which, *in conjunction with* other more orthodox approaches, may hold the promise of immense benefits to mankind.

Before we can profitably discuss non-medical healing at all, it is necessary to be quite sure what we mean by two much misused words—'miracles' and 'faith'.

In strict usage, miracle can mean two things.* First, it may mean an event definitely *contrary* to the known order of nature, such as the changing of base metal into gold or a stone statue nodding its head. Such miracles must be accounted frankly incredible and, although all the great religious traditions contain many instances of such miracles (e.g. Aaron's rod being changed into a serpent before Pharaoh), few today will believe them without incontrovertible evidence. Indeed, the insistence of some traditionalists on the literal truth of this type of miracle is among the causes responsible for the drift of modern youth from established religion. Even if we should not wish to oppose a dogmatic denial to the dogmatic assertion of tradition, it is far more likely that those who recorded these miraculous events were mistaken or deceived or that their testimony was later tampered with, than that such events happened as described. It is, further, significant that Buddha, Mohammed, and Jesus (e.g. in His third temptation) were at one in declining the role of mere 'wonder-worker'—and, as we see from His parting injunction to those He had cured, Jesus certainly shrank from the publicity which His healing-miracles involved.

The second meaning of miracle, and the one with which we are here concerned, is that of an event which appears to be contrary to nature, but in fact may not be so.

'Nature' is the physical universe known to us through our senses. But throughout his history man has known of the existence of another world, the supernatural—the world 'above or beyond nature'—with which he has contact, usually brief and intermittent, through his spiritual, intuitive, and psychic faculties. Nor is this other world a great illusion (as Freud supposed). The unanimity of the testimony of the great mystics and intuitives of all ages and creeds admits of no doubt that not only is it the great and abiding certainty; but that its reality, if different in quality, is not less real than that of the natural world.

It is true that as yet we understand very little of the working of that other world. But the lives of Jesus and of the great spirituals and saints are proof, if proof is needed, that it is not something wholly 'other' from our own experience. And it is in this sense that the supernatural is sometimes described as the supremely natural, the extension of our temporal reality into the world of spiritual reality of which we, as human beings, only occasionally and imperfectly attain to consciousness.

Whereas miracles of the first category we discussed are seldom, if ever, established by irrefutable evidence, there is an abundance of completely reliable testimony for the occurrence of healing-miracles. Now it has been an understandable human weakness to ascribe all events, which are not readily explicable by reference to a human agency or to the scientific knowledge available at the time, to a special act of divine volition working *contrary* to nature. But if the supernatural is not wholly *other* than the natural, but is rather an extension of it, it is reasonable to assume that it, too, is subject to law. Dr Weatherhead has rightly pointed out that God's

activity is evidenced just as much in a cure by drugs as in non-medical healing. We happen to know something of the laws of one treatment and little of the other. But that there should be a realm of the natural or supernatural worlds *not* subject to law—that *would* be an incredible dispensation of God! God is not capricious and Divine Law, if imperfectly understood by us, is not less law than natural law.

Healing-miracles, therefore, do not suppose an activity *contrary* to nature. Rather are they (in Dr Weatherhead's excellent words) 'the break-through into the human plane of the operation of laws belonging to a higher plane', a plane with which we are not normally familiar but which is none the less law-abiding and fitfully known to us in our moments of highest consciousness. I am fortified in this conclusion by the opinion of the London healer whose work I personally know best: 'I have observed that the effects (of my treatment) are sufficiently orderly and reliable to give every indication that some law is being expressed.'¹

This definition is important when we turn to consider the place of faith in healing. For the faith which orthodox religion and many healers often urge us to have—a belief contrary to experience, reason, and understanding—is not faith at all, but *credulity*; and it is seldom a satisfying, or even a possible, spiritual activity in this scientific age. Established religion urgently needs to abandon what is untrue in her teaching and to restate her findings as the expression of the progress of her unending search for truth. If healing-miracles had to be accepted (with other articles of belief) as things *contrary* to nature and opposed to reason and experience, they would only be a source of further conflict for the modern mind. But if, as I think, they can be shown to be consonant with reason, as far as reason goes, then faith in their possibility (as in the credibility of other articles of faith which go all the way with reason) will leap toward the conclusion which the trend of the evidence suggests. Reason, the synthesizing activity of the intellect, is as God-given as any other faculty; and our quest for truth requires that we be loyal (though not finally subservient) to reason in our inferences from the available evidence. We shall not find truth or health, where reason and faith conflict.

There is another misuse of the word 'faith'. Many healers exhort their patients to 'have faith' and, if a cure takes place, it is ascribed to their faith. If the healer fails, the patient's lack of faith is blamed. We will discuss later the possibly disastrous consequences of putting the whole onus on the patient. Here I want to emphasize that it is not the patient's faith (properly so called) but his *suggestibility*, which is in question. Suggestibility is something we have or have not, or only have a little. A powerful personality may increase our openness to suggestion and, since the mind has great power over the body, much may be achieved in such cases. But the 'miracle' is independent of real faith. Coué's cures were triumphs of suggestion and many of those healed at Lourdes were not Roman Catholics, some were not even Christians. Anyone with experience of healing will agree that many who have faith are not cured, and many that are cured have no discernible faith.

But, equally, faith, when distinguished from credulity and suggestibility, is quite certainly one of the several factors which affect the laws of healing. It need not be in any sense theological, the belief in particular credal statements. But, rather, it will at its lowest be an attitude of expectant trust in the healer or his gift. There no doubt have been cases where downright sceptics and cynics have been cured, but as a general rule an attitude of hopefulness will increase the chances of success. And there is a much fuller sense in which faith is essential to health and

conducive to healing, which we will consider after discussing the nature of illness and health.

Man has long known that his health is more than a physical matter. It is only quite lately that medical science has devoted itself to the treatment of the local symptoms of disease separately from the whole man. The interdependence of body, mind, and soul, is now once again forcing itself upon our attention. Many mental illnesses are now thought to have physical causes and are being attacked by physical remedies, such as electro-convulsion therapy and insulin shock-treatment. Apparently purely physical conditions, such as dermatitis, peptic ulcers, asthma, and paralyses, can often be shown to have a mental origin. Conversion-hysteria—the handing over to the body, in terms of disability, of some strain which the mind cannot bear—produces functional disease no less disabling than organic disease. Quite one of the most fascinating chapters of Dr Weatherhead's book deals with the speculations of medical men regarding the causes of what is now known as psychosomatic disease, where it is considered possible that many illnesses long regarded as purely physiogenic (such as tuberculosis, polio, and infectious diseases) may sometimes be caused or 'set off' by psychological or spiritual disharmonies. Psychological research, while not yet always able to suggest a cure, leaves no room to doubt the immense power over the body of repressed guilt complexes and emotional conditions resulting from deprivation of love, affection, good-will, appreciation, as also of hate, jealousy, anger, resentment, fear. As Dr Weatherhead especially emphasizes: 'If emotion is neither expressed in its appropriate action nor even admitted to consciousness, it will have its revenge by setting up some form of mental or physical distress.' And the revenge is planned by the unconscious mind (so that the patient is seldom to blame for a conscious decision and indeed may strongly oppose the symptom of distress) with great ingenuity, often taking advantage of some constitutional weakness and expressing itself so as to get the patient out of the difficulty which his unconscious mind cannot face.

The conclusions force themselves upon us that it is becoming increasingly difficult to draw the line between physical, mental, and spiritual sickness; that illness, like pain, is a symptom of disharmony somewhere within the personality framework, a disharmony which may be primarily in one category but which will almost certainly have secondary causes and effects in the other two; and that, even where it is possible to say with confidence that the sickness is confined to one category (e.g. a broken leg), its cure will be greatly expedited by the united effort of the whole man, body, mind, and spirit.

If illness can be shown to involve the whole personality, health must too; and I do not think that many today will dissent from Dr Weatherhead's definition: '*Health* is the complete and successful functioning of every part of the human being (body, mind, and spirit) in harmonious relationship with every other part and with the relevant environment.' And while the physical and mental aspects of this definition are fairly obvious, we should add that the spirit or soul of man is that part of him which makes contact with the supernatural world—or, as we say, with God. Perfect health, therefore, involves the harmony of the soul with God; and indeed so vital is this that we may agree with Dr Weatherhead that man is *not* a body which has a soul, but *is* a soul which has a body and a mind. And we shall certainly follow him in defining *healing* as the process of restoring the broken harmony of the body in the material world, of the mind in the realm of true ideas,

of the spirit in its relationship with God. In most cases the disharmony has to be dealt with (with differing emphasis) in all the categories of the personality in their relevant environments.

Implicit in these definitions of health and healing, is the positive function of faith in the creation of health and in the prevention of ill-health. Faith here is used in an entirely undenominational sense—as a working belief in and experience of God. This is not something which we can be exhorted to 'have'. It is something to be diligently sought for and won as the result of practised meditation and disciplined awareness; and the actual form it takes is unimportant. But it is faith in God and not in a treatment—an active affirmation of an inner unity with all existence and a recognition of the activity of God everywhere. We might call it a condition of permanent openness to God, which continues undiminished even if illness persists, but which greatly increases the chances of cure and the probability of enduring good-health thereafter. If healing is co-operation with God, as we shall shortly suggest, and perfect health involves a harmonious relationship with Him, then clearly a continual openness to Him is a condition (though possibly only one condition) of good health. We call that condition *faith* and this is the only proper use of that word in the context of healing.

Faith which *expects* everything demands that God fulfil *our* will. True faith accepts whatever happens in a spirit of active resignation, seeking in all things to understand the will of God and to co-operate with it lovingly. C. W. M. GELL

¹ *Psychology, Religion and Healing*, by Leslie D. Weatherhead (Hodder & Stoughton, London: 1951).

² This and the following paragraph owe much to Lord Samuel's article in the *Hibbert Journal*, July 1951.

³ *This Is My Heaven*, by W. J. MacMillan, p. 40.

THE ESSENTIAL TENNYSON

LIKE most Victorians, Tennyson has suffered a long eclipse. But of late the era and its great men have been seen in clearer perspective, and Tennyson, 'the heir of Keats and the successor of Wordsworth', has come into his own again. An output as large as his was bound to contain a good deal of conventional, weak, and downright bad verse; but what survives is of great value, though not all of it is what Tennyson and many of his contemporaries rated most highly. They thought of him, and he liked to think of himself, as a sage-poet: time has revealed that his greatness was in less ambitious spheres. The author of the famous line, 'one far-off divine event, to which the whole creation moves', fine though it is, is not so great a poet as the man who wrote:

*The splendour falls on castle walls
And snowy summits old in story:
The long light shakes across the lakes,
And the wild cataract leaps in glory.*

That is sheer magic, of a wonder and beauty rarely touched, even by Keats.

In much of Tennyson's greatest verse there is a very un-Victorian strain of melancholy. He had something in common with Poe. Both men strove to overcome their melancholia in the pursuit of high ideals; and, like Tennyson, Poe regarded himself, if not as a sage-poet, as a sage—witness *Eureka* and other prose works. But he lacked the Englishman's physical constitution and will-power, and in the end gave up the struggle.

According to Auden, Tennyson was 'undoubtedly the stupidest' of English poets. This is quite untrue. He was an encyclopedic reader, and was well acquainted with history, philosophy, and science. He was a founder of the Metaphysical Society, and numbered among his greatest friends Jowett, the famous Master of Balliol, who delighted in his conversation and told him that his poetry 'has an element of philosophy more to be considered than any regular philosopher in England'. He was very socially conscious, and was sensitive to the drift of events, believing, rightly, that the world was on the verge of a great revolution. In the practical side of his work, though generous, he was businesslike and astute.

Tennyson's emotional and poetic range was wide. Apart from his great variety in metre, rhythm, and language, he revealed a remarkable grasp of poetic ideas and forms. One of his most vivid and brilliant poems is the superb *Voyage of Maeldune*, based on an Irish legend, the last subject for which we should have expected him to have sympathy. Maeldune, blown out of his course on the way to avenge the death of his father, drifts to the Silent Isle, the Isle of Shouting, and the Isle of Flowers.

*Thro' the fire of the tulip and poppy, the blaze of gorse, and the blush
Of millions of roses that sprang without leaf or a thorn from the bush;
And the whole isle-side flashing down from the peak without ever a tree
Swept like a torrent of gems from the sky to the blue of the sea.*

The whole passage blazes with colour, and the effect is like a sudden vision of all the flowers of the world.

Tennyson was poor at satire, often pedantic, sometimes sentimental, almost humourless, at times futile. But always and in all moods he was a poet; and he was very English, as English as the view from the house at Haslemere where he died, looking out over the Sussex weald.

Perhaps the greatest of his works was *Maud*. It was his own favourite, and the one he liked best to read aloud. In variety of form and rhythm, in depth and range of emotion, it is superior to *In Memoriam*, fine though that is. The unvarying rhythm of the latter tends to become monotonous. In another poem, rather overrated today in some quarters, the *Wellington Ode*, he varies the rhythm, but ineffectively compared with *Maud*. One of the most striking things in *Maud* is the way in which the rhythms fit the mood. Thus in the opening poem, the rhythm exactly expresses the wild, passionate, despairing quality of the emotion. But he is not always successful in combining narrative and emotion, particularly in those parts of the poem which tell the story. The problem in a narrative poem is to harmonize the statement of fact with the expression of the emotion aroused by the fact: the objective with the subjective. There is no such harmony in the following lines.

*Did he fling himself down? who knows? for a vast speculation had fail'd,
And ever he muttr'd and maddn'd, and ever wann'd with despair,
And out he walk'd, when the wind like a broken worldling wail'd,
And the flying gold of the ruin'd woodlands drove through the air.*

Here we see the aptness of the rhythm to the emotion; but the contrast between fact and emotion is crude. Tennyson wishes to tell us why the narrator's father committed suicide, 'a vast speculation had fail'd', and the words are necessarily flat and factual; but immediately he makes an abrupt transition to the emotional state of the man with the melodramatic 'ever he muttr'd and madden'd', following with another abrupt transition to description, 'out he walk'd, when the wind like a broken worldling wail'd, and the flying gold of the ruin'd woodlands drove through the air.' These last two lines are among the great things of English poetry; but half their effect is lost through the weakness of the preceding lines and the awkward transitions. Yet taken as a whole the opening poem of *Maud* is one of the most impressive in the cycle. Where Tennyson does succeed in creating a harmony between narrative and emotion, we have perfection, as in the later poem: 'I was walking a mile.'

The experience which *Maud* enshrines is the eternal one of love and death. In treatment, Tennyson gives us two contrasting modes: the psychological and the social. The bitter and morbid mind of the narrator is paralleled by the tyrannous and decadent state of society; the injustices of his life by the injustices of social life; his integration in war by the nation's integration. Without denying the genuineness of the experience, we may question the success of the treatment. Aesthetic experience, says Professor Abercrombie, must be 'experience valued as such and enjoyable for its own sake'. On this ground *Maud* would come out unscathed. But, he adds, the experience has to be 'disintegrated' in order to be communicated, and the 'governing tendency toward a final reintegration into unity' is achieved only in the form of the work; and on this ground *Maud* is not altogether successful. The form that emerges from the twofold treatment never attains perfect

unity, perhaps because the psychological quality of the poem derives from an unsolved conflict in the poet himself.

Maud is an unreal figure. The verses describing her often have an artificial quality, and are even, at times, rather cheap. As in so much romantic 'love' Maud is more an idea than a person. The narrator is the centre of the poem—as Tennyson seems to have indicated in calling it a 'monodrama'. When Maud is described, the writing is weak: 'Shine out, little head, sunning over with curls.' But when the narrator's emotional reaction to her is expressed, the language is inspired.

*She is coming, my own, my sweet;
Were it ever so airy a tread,
My heart would hear it and beat,
Were it earth in an earthy bed;
My dust would hear her and beat
Had I lain for a century dead;
Would start and tremble under her feet,
And blossom in purple and red.*

This wonderful verse occurs only a few lines after the sentimental description of the curly head, a contrast that is characteristic of a great deal of Tennyson's work.

The analysis and expression of the narrator's moods is always convincing. Tennyson's powerful and deeply felt study of a morbid and introspective mind was genuine, since it derived from the dark strain in himself. It culminates in the great poem of madness, 'Dead, long dead', where the narrator, tortured with remorse at having killed Maud's brother and with grief at her subsequent death loses his reason and is shut away. The power with which the poet evokes the disordered and despairing mind of the melancholic could only have come from something inside himself.

*Dead, long dead,
Long dead!
And my heart is a handful of dust,
And the wheels go over my head,
And my bones are shaken with pain,
For into a shallow grave they are thrust,
Only a yard beneath the street.*

Later in the poem, a momentary evocation of past happiness is suddenly overlaid with grotesque imagery, bringing, with a shock, something of the strange feeling of obscenity we often associate with the insane. And then the most realistic touch of all—the querulous question, so utterly disproportionate to the dark horror of the situation:

*O me, why have they not buried me deep enough?
Is it kind to have made me a grave so rough,
Me, that was never a quiet sleeper.*

Whatever faults it may have, *Maud* is a great and memorable poem. Tennyson is

rightly praised for the beauty of his language; but this should not blind us to his power, of which *Maud* provides so many examples.

*Is it gone? my pulses beat—
What was it? a lying trick of the brain?
Yet I thought I saw her stand,
A shadow there at my feet,
High over the shadowy land.*

In the shadow of *Maud* 'high over the shadowy land' we intellectually grasp the profound significance of her innocence which has unwittingly darkened the narrator's life, and at the same time receive a vivid image of an immense shadow stretching across the darkening landscape.

The dark strain in Tennyson was transcended by a deep but unorthodox religious faith. He was, perhaps, what we should today call a modernist: he had a profound faith in God and the immortality of the soul, and a sincere devotion to the person of Christ; but he resolved his doubts on revealed religion by making a Kantian distinction between the outer world of fact and the inner world of experience. He suffered from torturing doubts, but never took the coward's path, looking always toward the 'one far-off divine event'.

*Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark!
And may there be no sadness of farewell,
When I embark;*

*And tho' from out our bourne of Time and Place
The flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crossed the bar.*

ROBERT HAMILTON

Recent Literature

Edited by C. RYDER SMITH.

Introduction to the Old Testament, by Aage Bentzen, second edition, with corrections and a supplement. (G. E. C. Gad, Copenhagen, £4.)

The original Danish edition of this work appeared during the war. An English translation, embodying considerable modification and rearrangement of the material, was published in 1948 and 1949. It was immediately welcomed in this country as an invaluable guide to the newer literature on the subject which had appeared on the Continent, and particularly in Scandinavia. But the second edition, like the first, is much more than a record of contemporary trends in criticism. It is an immense boon to have, in addition, a treatment in a single comprehensive work of the problems of text and canon, a discussion of the forms of Old Testament literature (a subject which has received much less attention here than abroad), and an introduction to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. The second edition has been reproduced photographically, and extensive revision has therefore not been possible. But many minor improvements and additions have been made. Longer additions, where needed, have been assembled in an appendix of some thirty pages. The result is a remarkably up-to-date volume. Professor Bentzen's sympathy with some recent theories is tempered by a sane criticism, and he is an unusually reliable guide through the complexities of a subject in which there is at present such diversity of view.

G. W. ANDERSON

The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, by C. H. Dodd. (Cambridge, 42s.)

This book does not offer a verse-by-verse exposition of the text, but an interpretation of the evangelist's fundamental ideas. Its author has, as he tells us, 'left on one side' 'purely critical questions', and does not deal with suggested 'rearrangements' of chapters or paragraphs. What we are given is a theological interpretation of a theological masterpiece. The author believes that the Gospel was written for the benefit of Gentile readers who were already steeped in the language and ideas of 'Hermetic Literature', and the first part of his book gives us an account of this. Chapters follow on Philo of Alexandria, Rabbinic Judaism, Gnosticism, and Mandaism. The next part of the book is concerned with its leading ideas under the headings 'Symbolism' (a specially illuminating chapter), 'Eternal Life', 'Knowledge of God', 'Truth', 'Faith', 'Union with God', 'Light', 'Glory', and 'Judgement', 'Spirit', 'Messiah' (here the title 'The Lamb of God' is equated with 'The King of Israel' as a traditional Messianic title), 'Son of Man', 'Son of God', and 'Logos'. Under the last the author is readier than most recent scholars to find affinities with the Philonic Logos, and rejects in a couple of footnotes Burkitt's suggestion that 'Logos' means 'spoken word' in John 11-12, and that the first verse should be translated 'The Word was spoken to God, and was itself God'. On page 292 we come at last to the text which is divided into a 'Proem', a 'Book of Signs' with seven 'episodes', and 'the Book of the Passion'. The Gospel proper is taken as ending at 20₃₁. A short 'appendix' follows which deals, rather summarily, with the basis of the Gospel in actual history. I cannot avoid making two observations. One is that this book gives us far and away the most completely integrated interpretation of the ideas of the Fourth Gospel that I have seen. I cannot sufficiently admire the skill with which its author keeps all his balls in the air as he moves to the conclusion of his argument. This book may well come to be regarded as a classic in its own genre. At the same time, I must confess to certain hesitations. Like most of our New Testament scholars, Dr Dodd has left far behind him the study of the Gospels for edification, or as a well from which an inexhaustible supply of homiletic material can be drawn. He confines himself to the question: 'What did the author really

mean?' It is obviously right that the Word of God in the Bible, as in the natural creation, should be studied without ulterior motives of any kind, but some of us are intensely aware that the gulf between the academic and the—comparatively—uninstructed Christian is becoming dangerously deep. To mention a little thing, on every page Dr Dodd 'drops into' Greek. Who will interpret the interpreter? It is more serious that little or no attention is given to the question which really matters to the thoughtful Christian reader: 'Did Jesus of Nazareth really do and say many of the things attributed to Him in the Gospels?' For such a reader it is not enough to say that episodes and utterances found there illustrate certain true ideas about Him, for in his heart of hearts he knows that it is the words of Jesus Himself that are 'spirit and life', that He alone is the bread from Heaven. This problem is most acute in the Fourth Gospel, and the author's argument—in the Appendix—that much of the evangelist's material may well have come from 'oral tradition' only provides a vague reassurance. There is no definite answer to the question: 'To what extent does the trained and sensitive judgement of a scholar lead him to think that Jesus did use the kind of language or type of argument so common in the Fourth Gospel, so rare in the others?' Perhaps any such discussion demands another book. Happily, however, as it seems to me, the words of Jesus Himself can be distinguished by comparatively simple-minded men who read the Gospels daily. But, under such an incident as that of the woman at the well, what does Dr Dodd mean by 'I find it impossible to imagine circumstances in which either of the only two persons present would have repeated the story in this form'. Why? Is it not at least as unscientific to deny as to assume that Jesus could have told the disciples, or some of them, what He had been doing while they were away?

J. A. FINDLAY

L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Galates, by Pierre Bonnard; *L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Éphésiens*, by Charles Masson. (Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchâtel, frs. suisses 12.50).

The same two professors at Lausanne who contributed commentaries on Philippians and Colossians to the new *Commentaire du Nouveau Testament*, are responsible for this valuable and very interesting volume. The commentary on Galatians, restricted to 123 pages, is just what such a commentary should be—concise, clear, and always relevant. Discursiveness and digressions are rigorously excluded. The meanings of words, phrases and paragraphs are brought out in vigorous, virile sentences. When the original Greek is cited, it is always with a translation or careful explanation. The author does, however, find room for six admirable 'Excursus', in which he discusses such topics of immediate importance as 'Christian Liberty' and the relationship of Galatians to Acts and Romans. In the brief introduction, questions of date, purpose, provenance and destination are dealt with concisely, but not inadequately. The author strongly supports what in this country had become the almost out-moded 'North-Galatian' theory, but he presents the case for the other side so fairly that the reader almost wonders how he came to discard it. The commentary on Ephesians suffers from the defect of attempting too much. Ninety pages are insufficient to include the advocacy of any novel theories. The author has, however, sought to reintroduce a somewhat revised form of the complicated theory of inter-relationship between Ephesians and Colossians put forward by H. J. Holtzmann eighty years ago, and largely discarded since. The discussion of the issue is unfortunately left to a summary at the end, with the result that the reader's mind can hardly avoid being distracted from the exposition by continual expectation of proofs of the author's unusual point of view. It is true that the author dealt with this in part in his earlier volume on Colossians, but that only prompts the question: 'Why did not Colossians and Ephesians appear in the same volume?' The author does not mention E. J. Goodspeed's work on Ephesians, which shows how this epistle is built up not only from materials derived from Colossians, but also from the other Pauline letters. This makes it difficult to accept Prof. Masson's contention that Ephesians 1-14 is a hymn borrowed by the post-

Pauline author from the liturgy of the Church, for these very verses contain echoes of Paul's letters. Again, his claim that such words as *oikonomia*, *pleroma* and *mysterion* are used in Colossians and Ephesians with the same meaning (different from normal Pauline usage), is very seriously open to question. To establish these opinions would require a separate book of considerable size, and the brief attempt made in this book to do so inevitably tends to divert interest from the many good things in the commentary proper.

C. LESLIE MITTON

Schism in the Early Church, by S. L. Greenslade. (S.C.M., 21s.)

This admirable book, written by an Anglican who would bring his great learning to the cause of Church reunion, has warmed the heart of a Methodist who is devoted to the same cause. A schism, as distinct from a heresy, may be defined as a division in the Church, arising and existing without any compelling divergence in spiritual or theoretical principle, but substantially occasioned by the 'non-theological factors' of human frailty and sinfulness. As the unhappy division between the Methodist Society and the Mother Church is a classic example of such a schism, the Methodist will read this book with sympathy and profit. It shows that the ancient Church has something vital and compelling to say for today. Dr Greenslade makes clear the extent to which the historic schisms of the Church were occasioned by social and nationalist tension, the rivalry of sees, differences in liturgical preference, and problems of ecclesiastical discipline. Yet, in spite of all, God mightily used the ancient Church. So may He use us, for past schisms which seemed as large and enduring as those which today distress us passed away. In reaction to schism the Church had recourse to the secular arm, to negotiation and discipline, and to theological reflection, especially under the doctrine of the Ministry and Sacraments. While the author affirms that St Cyprian was in a strong position in teaching that the Ministry and Sacraments only function within the one Church, he shows too, against Cyprian, that it is not enough to say that 'the other party' ceases to belong to it. In a sense, the Church is divided. Again, he shows that, while St Augustine rightly maintained that the unworthiness of the minister does not abolish the efficacy of the Sacraments, deductions later drawn from this doctrine have sometimes led theologians astray. On the reunion movement Dr Greenslade maintains that all Christians who acknowledge the Bible and the Creeds are a part of the Church, that Spirit-blessed and orthodox Ministries outside the episcopal succession are Ministries within the Church, that Episcopal Churches ought to allow intercommunion in suitable cases, and that full communion is to be earnestly sought upon the basis of an episcopal Ministry. Were all the Churches in England to be persuaded by this informed and charitable writer we should soon have reunion in a reformed national Church.

JOHN LAWSON

His Appearing and His Kingdom, by T. Francis Glasson. (The Epworth Press, 16s.)

In this book Dr Glasson, after recapitulating the conclusions of his earlier book on Jesus' own teaching, sets out to trace the history of Christian thought on the fascinating subjects of the Second Advent, Judgement, Resurrection, the End of History, and the prospects for the future of Christianity. In the first part of the book his review of ancient and modern millenarianism and chiliasm suggests that the earliest Church was not as solidly chiliastic as has been supposed. A survey of some of the attempts to date the 'end of the world' and to identify 'antichrist' shows into what tortuous paths some believers have wandered. The brief summaries of modern chiliastic and millenarian sects will be valuable ammunition for those who have to deal with views which often trouble our people. On the question of judgement, the writer holds that there has been a confusion arising from a false identification of individual judgement with the 'Day of the Lord', which strictly applies to the judgement of nations. The result has been the postulating of an intermediate state. But this does not easily harmonize with the widespread conviction, which has clear New Testament evidence to support it, that those who die in

faith depart to be with the Lord, and there is little point in the long interval between the first and second judgements if the purpose of the latter is merely to ratify the earlier decision. Dr Glasson concludes that unless we break free from the literal interpretation of symbolic language, the traditional views of judgement, resurrection and the Second Advent present difficulties which are well-nigh insuperable. The second part of the book deals with the ultimate victory of Christ. Dr Glasson is a firm believer in the final triumph of Christ on this earth (which is not quite the same as universalism). The greatest obstacle to this view in Christian thought has been the belief, mistakenly based on Jewish Messianic woes, that there is to be a final and inevitable apostasy. Although neither Augustine nor the Continental reformers were firm believers in the final triumph of Christ on earth, and held to the view of impending doom and apostasy, Augustine's conception of the two cities continuing side by side, the eternal city of God remaining while earthly cities rise and fall, presents a clue to the mystery of the way in which the purpose of God will be perfected while continual decay attacks human institutions. If traditional views are spiritually discerned, we can discard literal views of the descent of Christ and bodily resurrection, and reject entirely the notion of final apostasy. We are left with a faith which sees Christ now reigning in the lives of Christians and the Church, and looks forward to his eventual triumph in the world. This bird's-eye view of the course of Christian thought on these fascinating topics is illustrated with a wealth of quotations from every century, and its optimistic conclusion will prove a welcome word to a generation which has had more than its share of pessimism.

WILLIAM STRAWSON

The Fruits of Controversy, by Edward Langton. (Lutterworth Press, 15s.)

If Dr Langton had confined this book to a history of the Pilgrim Fathers—their convictions, persecutions, experiences in the Netherlands, journey to the New World, and so on—he would have met a real need both in the field of Church History and the general history of freedom. But unfortunately he adds an account of the English and Scottish Reformations from a very decided point of view. While in essentials this might well be the right one, he expresses it in a lamentably one-sided manner, and this prevents him from doing elementary justice to the Anglican standpoint. His book begs many questions, and to describe, not once but many times, the rulers of England as bowing down before 'the idol of uniformity', hinders historical understanding. It is right and proper, in an age which derides Puritanism in many foolish and uninformed ways, to insist that the Puritans were spiritually minded, but it is false and wrong to suggest that no one else was. Dr Langton draws to the conclusion of his book with an eloquent defence of controversy, and ends with an interesting chapter in which he attacks the notion of organic Christian unity, and states and defends his preference for spiritual unity expressed in some form of Federal Union. Here again he seems neither to appreciate fully the strength of other positions, nor to admit even the slightest suggestion of error in his own. Yet he is a vivid story-teller, and anyone who wants to know about the Pilgrim Fathers should certainly read what he has to say.

RUPERT E. DAVIES

Studies in Muslim Ethics, by Dwight M. Donaldson. (S.P.C.K., 27s. 6d.)

Dr Donaldson, till recently Principal of the Henry Martyn School of Islamic Studies at Aligarh, has made a fine contribution to the study of Islam by this competent volume on Muslim Ethics, especially as a work specifically on this subject has been long overdue. The book is very comprehensive. While Dr Donaldson claims no more than that he has given 'a comprehensive summary in English' of Islamic ethical teachings, in fact he has accomplished more than this, for nowhere else is there gathered the material which we have here. Starting with an account of the virtues of the ancient Arabs, the author goes on to deal with the basic and normative ethics of the *Qur'an* and the Traditions. Next he notes the foundations of the philosophical ethics of Islam. Here perhaps one might have expected more reference to the Aristotelian and Galenist elements, since these

prevailed more than the Plotinian philosophy and the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Theology*, though undoubtedly the latter had much influence also. The author passes in review the most important works of Ibn Miskawayh and Al Ghazzālī, and the manuals compiled in Persian which still have some popularity. There follow two chapters on the ethics both of the early mystics and the great Sufis of Persia. Copious quotations are given from English translations, including the writer's own. There is a valuable review of modern ethical interpretations, and in the last chapter, having shown creditable objectivity in the presentation of his material, Dr Donaldson permits himself to make some comparisons with Christian ideals. There is a very good bibliography. J. W. SWEETMAN

Bridge to Islam, a study of the religious forces of Islam and Christianity in the Near East, by Erich W. Bethmann. (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 15s.)

This is a revised edition of a book published in 1950 in America, written to inform missionaries and others interested in the S.D.A. Mission in the Near East. The author shows true missionary sincerity and feeling, and often presents an important point of view. His generalizations are irreproachable, as when he advises that missionaries should be courteous, hospitable, have strong stomachs, be able to distinguish between their primary task and the advocacy of 'Westernism', and his general survey of the Near East is of distinct value, especially as an introduction to Islam in those areas. It is when we come to the discussion of the 'Bridge,' which occupies only fifteen pages at the end of the book, that we feel the treatment is thin and the bridge very frail and precarious. Tentative feelers sent out into the unknown are not bridges, for these must be founded firmly at both ends. Here many questions are left unanswered. Readers are told that the use of 'Son of God' for Christ is almost blasphemous to Muslims, but they are not helped to resolve the difficulty when such a use is biblical. In general the author shows too little appreciation of the role played by the Bible in commending Christ to Muslims, and his approach to argument from the Bible is from 'the prophecies of Daniel which span human history and reach unto the end of the time'. 'Missionaries trained in religious and philosophical thinking' are desiderated, but the use of philosophy in apologetic is deprecated. The writer wisely points to the danger of indulging in debate—for every Christian advocate knows that there are limits to the power of logic and that faith cannot be inculcated by syllogisms—but one is left wondering whether he has really grasped Macdonald's meaning when he quotes: 'When our missionaries go to Muslims with a non-theological temper of mind, they are simply unintelligible.' J. W. SWEETMAN

History of Philosophy, Eastern and Western, by Various Authors; Chairman of the Editorial Board, Dr Radhakrishnan; Sponsored by the Ministry of Education, Government of India. (Allen & Unwin, 2 vols., 65s. the set.)

A large book of this kind was a necessary enterprise, for comparative philosophy is a much-needed study, but one yet in its infancy. And here it is attempted by a strong team of writers, under a distinguished Editorial Board, and with Government backing. The result is a good, solid piece of work; no one will agree with it all, but its scholarship is reasonably accurate and objective. Yet one is left with a feeling that a great opportunity has been largely missed. The book hardly ever comes to life. It is sadly dehumanized; only rarely is any social background given, and never any substantial biographical background; one could never guess from this book, for instance, what an exciting figure Samkara was; and it is only rarely that one is able, through the lists of writings and doctrines, to get the sense of great minds grappling with great problems. (Honourable exceptions are the few pages on *lila* and the chapters on 'Socrates to Aristotle' and on Marxism.) And this dictionary attitude leads to there being little comparison of the great traditions. The customary parallels are drawn; but little sense is given of philosophy as a series of answers to a few central questions, and of the different traditions as helpfully and excitingly casting light on one another. As for the editing, the Board seeks to retreat

under its system, by saying that it has left the writers full freedom of treatment, though 'aware' of 'serious limitations' in this method. But that does not excuse such lack of balance as is shown by the twenty-eight drearily written pages given to Sakta, or the overlapping within the section on Buddhism, or the meagre treatment of non-Indian Asiatic thought (e.g., only two lines are given to Zen Buddhism!), or the omission of the whole range of Greek thought after Aristotle except the Neoplatonists! Much space is wasted in the Indian portion by key-concepts, which appear in all or most of the systems, being expounded several times instead of once for all. Surely the justification, and golden opportunity, of a book like this is *synopsis*, and this cannot be had without strong editing. On minor matters—many misprints, the bad indices, much poor idiom, and some freaks of typography should have been put right. Above all, the editors ought to have decided firmly what they mean by 'philosophy'. Apparently they take it to include religion in its non-revelational forms: accordingly, Indian religious thought is fully expounded, and Christian mysticism is given a chapter (unfortunately a feeble one); but Christian theology, which includes so much of the best Western thinking on the ultimates, is ruled out, and the Jewish and Islamic systems are treated only in periods remote from their prophetic founders. There are chapters on Indian mathematics and science, but none on their non-Indian counterparts. There are only passing references to ethics, aesthetics, and political theory. While the book is a good and useful one, what a great book it might have been!

J. F. BUTLER

Natural Religion and Christian Theology, The Gifford Lectures for 1951, by C. E. Raven; First Series: Science and Religion. (Cambridge Press, 21s.)

A new openness of mind on the part of scientists, and a decline of the neo-orthodoxy which has obstructed the discussion between scientists and theologians since the 1930s, makes this an opportune time to recall theology to its traditional task, to the study of 'God and everything else together'. Few theologians are better equipped to take the lead here than Prof. Raven. In this First Series of Gifford Lectures his concern is with the religious evaluation of nature. To a generation which takes evolution seriously, nature is no mere stage for human life, but an integral part of the play, and this must enlarge our conception of the scope and character of religion. Moreover, the survey attempted here sets the development of science in its true perspective, so that the historian of culture, as well as the theologian, will find much that is important. After an introductory chapter, we examine the 'Biblical attitude toward nature'. Belief in the Word made flesh would seem to commit the Christian to a high view of nature. But in Chapter 3 we watch a distorted attitude developing in the early Church after the first promise of the Logos theology. The scholasticism which revived at the end of the first Christian millenium was conditioned by belief in the radical disparity of the natural and supernatural. The hope of a more wholesome view implied in St Francis's attitude and found in the Franciscans did not prevail, and the later upheavals of the Renaissance and Reformation were made inevitable. It is one of Prof. Raven's main contentions that in its earlier modern stages, science owed much more to biologists than to astronomers, and in Chapter 5 we study one group of pioneers, of whom Gesner was the finest product, which were mainly responsible for the astonishing progress of biological studies in the second quarter of the sixteenth century. In the latter half of the seventeenth, the age of genius, there was in England among Christians a degree of friendliness or even enthusiasm for the New Philosophy which contrasted sharply with the attitudes both of Catholics and Protestants in Europe, and which played no small part in promoting the study of nature as a devout enterprise. For this favourable atmosphere the Cambridge Platonists are chiefly to be thanked, Cudworth receiving special attention. But by the second decade of the eighteenth century the scientific project has narrowed, a mechanistic outlook has arisen, and biology as well as religion lacks worthy representatives. There follow chapters on

'Newton and the Age of the Machine', the biological work of the eighteenth century, and 'Linnaeus and the Coming of System'. A chapter on 'Darwin and the Century of Conflict' leads us into the perplexities of the nineteenth century. It is doubtless because of the fuller treatment in 'Science, Religion and the Future', an earlier book by the author, that this chapter is less detailed than we could wish. The present volume ends with a survey of the 'New Situation', with some suggestions for resuming the theological task in its full scope which we hope will be developed in the Second Series of the lectures. We may indeed borrow words which he uses of Ray and apply them to Prof. Raven himself: 'It is this sense of the wholeness and consistency of the natural order and its congruity with a reasonable Christian philosophy that (gives) his work its influence and constitutes its principal merit.'

A. W. HEATHCOTE

The Christian Approach to Culture, by Emile Cailliet. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via The Epworth Press, \$3.75.)

'Our culture has grown unevenly, in distorted and even monstrous ways, for want of that proper guidance and integration under God, which only a well-established theology could give.' Such is the contention of a book dedicated 'to Christian workers everywhere . . . who have come to the candid admission that they have lost their way in the wilderness of the contemporary world'. What the writer means by 'culture' is not clear, but it appears to be the structure of philosophy and science independently of the Christian faith. He passes in review the story of 'culture' from Socrates to Aquinas, and so comes to the Reformation. After it Bacon and Descartes led the way downhill to Locke and Kant, whose 'product' suggests 'the crystallization of the already abandoned rationalizations of an obsolete science and an obsolete moralism'. Spinoza, Leibnitz and Hume are left out of account; but Fichte and Hegel prepare the way for Marx and the bewildering but seductive perplexities of modern science, only in part relieved by Whitehead. The result is a deep sense of frustration, seen in the influence of Byron, Baudelaire, Horace Walpole, Scott even, Nietzsche and Hardy, and in the zest for Buddhism, archaeology, exegesis and the like, until today communism faces us with the dread religion of anti-Christ. Escape might be found in a truer ontology, based on a deeper understanding of Exodus 3, which would reveal God, not as the 'ab-solute' (*sic*), but as the 'cosmic self', the Ego of the Universe. We shall then see theology, not in the twilight, but in the dawn of a new day. The author's own thought is not yet wholly integrated. His style has more than it needs of the rhetorical, the epigrammatic, and, in places, of the inexact. The problem of the divine Person, the 'all' and yet the 'other', is not really grappled with, nor is that of evil, the rock on which so many systems have foundered. Again, in his review of 'culture', especially in the last four centuries, the author, a 'too-quick despairer', has been tempted to neglect the positive achievements both of culture and of Christianity. But he is convinced that for this world, and perhaps for others, the word of God is the Man Christ Jesus; and if he sets us thinking afresh on this vast subject, he deserves our thanks.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

Man in This World, by Hans Zehrer. (Hodder & Stoughton, 25s.)

When this book first appeared in Germany, its very appearance testified to chaos, for it had to be printed on large newspaper sheets! While it was very long (this English version is an abridgement), and its style repetitious and difficult, it was an analysis of great profundity and originality of the plight of modern man. Its author is a layman and a journalist, the brilliant editor of Hans Lilje's *Sonntagsblatt* (surely the best Protestant religious newspaper in existence), and he has a width of learning and a sureness of theological background which has no ready English parallel. Like a map-maker, he has a point of reference which conditions the whole direction of what he has to say: he begins with 'the Man in the Hut', the dispossessed, homeless, hopeless, displaced person, —that terrible figure who has appeared in his millions in one part of our world

after another (and who appeared to us like a warning ghost during the Blitz). The preacher's task is to answer the deep questions of this man: 'Who am I? What am I living for? What is the sense of it all?' The tragic dilemma of the organized Church and its parsons is that, as it still belongs to an ordered pattern of existence, it is almost desperately unfitted to bring the dispossessed in his anxiety and hopelessness face to face with One who, like himself, had not where to lay His head, and faced pain and loneliness and death as imminent horizons. We in England, because normally we do not preach to such a desperate situation, can easily fail to understand how close it is to the Bible. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns has said 'the one fundamental moral problem is what we should still possess if the whole of our world were destroyed tomorrow and we stood naked before God'. The Man in the Hut is astonishingly like the distraught figure of 'Christian' in the opening paragraphs of *Pilgrim's Progress*—but without a book in his hands. Zehrer goes on to show that what has happened catastrophically and physically to the refugee is simply a speeding-up of a disintegrating process, to be traced throughout the whole of post-renaissance culture, by which man, assured of his own integrity and thinking he is master of his fate, finds himself at the mercy of the universe (and so on the very edge of the truth that it is God who has us at His mercy). This is an important book for parsons to read and for groups of them to study. While Zehrer seems sometimes to fit the facts into some brilliant and poignant mental pattern, he has neither the facile optimism of the humanist nor the dark fatalisms of Spengler. When we have looked with Zehrer at the almost bewilderingly varied ranges of life today, we are brought home at the end, with Nicholas of Cusa and with Pascal, to the God who has sought men along the very hardest and dreariest of their chosen desert ways, and to the two mighty watchwords: 'Sola Fide' — 'Sola Gratia.'

GORDON RUPP

The Psychology of Unbelief, by H. C. Rümke. Trans. from the Dutch by M. H. C. Willems. (Rockliff, 7s. 6d.)

This small work comes from a professor at Utrecht, who is both an experienced analyst, standing close to the Freudian position, and a Christian believer. He sends out his book with the hope that it may be of some use in combating rebellion against belief and in strengthening the watchfulness and humility of those who believe. It is the position which he takes up and the very diffidence and caution he shows which impress the reader. He starts from the working hypothesis that every man has a well-defined form of belief. The religious unbeliever himself believes something. Rümke's opinion is that 'belief accompanies us in our development and maturity' and that 'the various forms through which belief passes constitute development'. His aim is to follow the course which religious experience follows and to point out some of the obstacles which turn men aside into unbelief. He enumerates seven stages, starting with the feeling that one is meaningfully linked up with the whole of being and ending with the demand for full surrender to God. Of the chapters that deal with them, the fifth and longest is most valuable. Here he frankly admits that in his experience many people's religion has the structure laid bare in Freud's projection theory of the origin of religion. But he believes that it is possible to distinguish phenomenologically between pseudo-childish belief and real belief. The infantile origin of the God-image is betrayed by a 'God-father thought too much emphasized; exaggerated rebellion against God; too great familiarity; too much expectation of reward; excessive fear; too easily roused disappointment if desire is not fulfilled or not fulfilled immediately; or too close resemblance of the God-image with the worldly father'. Freud's cardinal mistake lay in identifying neurotic belief, which he observed quite correctly and which he knew thoroughly, with real, primary belief which—everything points to this—he did not know. Rümke makes the usual point—that the experiences outlined in the seven stages fail completely to show in their pure state the characteristics of neurosis, and that 'nowhere has fictitious activity (and neurosis contains

fiction to the highest degree) had such a stirring, consecrating, and liberating force' as true belief. And his further words are indeed notable: 'I have treated many people by psychoanalysis. In the course of analysis I have never seen real belief founder, but repressed belief—which occurs quite often—has been liberated through analysis'. Moreover, 'so-called unbelief shows a much stronger affinity with neurosis than real belief. We see this, first of all, in Freud's work: he describes, in fact, real unbelief . . . many of the psychologic relationships observed by Freud were a hindrance to belief instead of an encouragement'. The book is not too easy to read, partly because it is a translation, and partly because of its brevity.

A. W. HEATHCOTE

Challenge of the Unknown, by Louis K. Anspacher. (Geo. Allen and Unwin, 16s.)

Dr Anspacher has brought together a remarkable collection of facts and reports concerning the phenomena of which one tends to say at once: 'I don't believe it!' After reading this book, however, it can only be a very determined and somewhat irrational sceptic who can say: 'I don't believe in any of it.' Dr Anspacher ranges over an enormous field, from the telepathic and clairvoyant characteristics of Socrates to the amazing mathematical calculations of the horses of Elberfeld, and from the psychic elements of the Scriptures to the calculating geniuses like Zerah Colburn, who, in an instant, gave the correct cube root of 268,336,125, and multiplied 8 to the sixteenth, an answer which required fifteen numerals to express it! The writer, it is true, is not always sufficiently critical. He treats the book of Daniel as if it were a record of history, says that Paul took over most of Plato's metaphysics, and that the ethical teaching of Christianity 'can be found in Buddhism, Confucianism, Shintoism (*sic*), Zoroastrianism,' a sweeping and unjustifiable generalization. The importance of this book, however, lies in the vast collection of *well-evidenced* phenomena which the learned world still obstinately refuses to consider. This is so, for instance, with J. B. Rhine's investigations of chance, for he often reaches positive results. Science is usually unwilling to extend its long-established and unquestioned traditions so as to make room for inquiry into those aspects of experience which refuse to conform to them. One hopes that this book will not be refused a hearing. Even if half of it were set aside as 'not proven' and a discount taken from the rest, a *prima facie* case for *investigation* has been made out. This could not be made by the methods of physical science, but is there not room for a new branch of psychical science? It would, of course, be objective, factual, and wholly removed from the fashion of those who prefer miracle to method. It might well take as its motto Faraday's words: 'Nothing is too wonderful to be true.'

E. S. WATERHOUSE

Hebrew Marriage, a Sociological Study, by David R. Mace. (The Epworth Press, 21s.)

This is a thoroughly painstaking investigation of the marriage customs, rites and laws of the Hebrew people, as they appear in the Old Testament. As such, it is in line with current sociological inquiry under marriage and the family, whether in primitive society or modern civilization. In his Preface, Dr Mace indicates his reason for undertaking the study. His preoccupation with the Marriage Guidance Movement, of which he was a pioneer, has not finally balked his desire to undertake prolonged research under the conviction that 'most existing studies of the subject had not begun far enough back'. 'The fundamental origins of our values and traditions in this field (as in many others)', it seemed to him, 'lay in Semitic culture generally, and in particular in the psychology and sociology of the Hebrews.' Hence his choice of subject. At the outset, he indicates that he rejects the earlier evolutionary theory of McLennan which derived monogamy from promiscuity by way of polyandry and polygyny, and therefore dissents from Robertson Smith's application of that theory to Semitic marriage institutions in *Kinship and Marriage*. Equally, in his concluding chapter, he is explicit as to the conclusions to which he believes his study to lead. Far too great emphasis, in his view, has been placed upon matriarchical origins supposed to lie behind Old Testament custom and tradition.

He dissents from the ascription to the Hebrews of widespread polygamy, despite superficial appearances to the contrary, and stoutly concludes 'that the Hebrews were from the beginning essentially monogamous, both in theory and practice'. He comments on the notable absence in the Old Testament of any kind of sexual asceticism, and believes that it throws light on the 'double standard' of sex morality. One standard is explained by a feeling for the essential goodness of the sexual function, and the other by the keen desire of every Hebrew for progeny to carry on the family. 'The need of the Hebrew for a son is the key to the whole structure of his family life, at least in the early days of the Old Testament.' I do not dissent from these conclusions, but I confess to an uneasy wonder whether they were not perhaps present to Dr Mace's mind before he set out on his investigations. His satisfaction in reaching them is manifest. His citation of his sources is meticulous, and he displays a real knowledge of what Old Testament scholarship has to say on the matters he discusses. It is a pleasure to notice his repeated references to the work in the same field of Dr Ryder Smith and Dr Lofthouse. His book is well worthy of the attention of all who are interested in the subject of marriage. E. C. URWIN

The State of Matrimony, by Reginald Haw. (S.P.C.K., 21s.)

This excellent book, written by an Anglican for Anglicans, is worth the study of all Christians. The author defines the essential concepts of marriage as free consent, true union, lifelong intention, and monogamy. He seeks to prove that despite the Reformation, King Henry's matrimonial adventures, Lutheran and Calvinistic influences, the Church of England has remained true to scriptural teaching, that marriage is indissoluble, and that only the medieval dispensations and prohibitions have been changed. In its first part, the book is largely historical, tracing the consistency in the witness of the Anglican Church, examining its pronouncements, and distinguishing between marriage as a sacramental status and a legal contract, yet recognizing that the State must legislate for the non-Christian. The second part of the book deals with the State and Marriage, showing how civil authority has replaced ecclesiastical court in matrimonial judgements, how the State has granted divorce despite the Church, and yet has adopted laws of registration with her agreement. In a final chapter the writer concludes that marriage *cannot* be dissolved, and that therefore it is as wrong to 're-marry' an 'innocent' as a 'guilty' person. The writer admits that such a view will never be accepted by the State, yet he rejects the idea of separate civil and religious ceremonies, and maintains that the Church must make an opportunity out of the difficulties, and demand reasonable and just conditions from those who seek her ministry. The solution of marital problems must be by penitence, forgiveness, and grace. This scholarly, provocative, instructive, and interesting book will help to clarify the thinking of all who study it even though they may not accept all its conclusions. HERBERT MILLS

The Unitarian Contribution to Social Progress in England, by R. V. Holt. (Lindsey Press, 16s.)

This is a revised edition of an admirable study, first issued in 1938, in which Mr Holt examines social and political movements of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and indicates the part played therein by Unitarians. He takes, for example, the Factory Acts, notes the important work of John Fielden, but notes also the opposition of Mark Philips and Edward Strutt. He deals in the same way with parliamentary reform, anti-slavery agitation, education, etc. There are a few notable names—Priestley, Bentham—but most are little known. Yet from what appears at first sight to be a painstaking but uninspiring catalogue of forgotten worthies, there emerges a picture of a body of men, led by capable representatives of the industrialist and merchant classes, who were commendably active in humanitarian service. Students who wish to fill in the background of the story of the struggle for social reform, especially in the first half of the nineteenth century, will find Mr Holt's book a mine of useful information. EDWARD ROGERS

Sermons on the Parables of Jesus, by Charles M. Crowe. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via The Epworth Press, \$2.50.)

A More Excellent Way, by Leslie J. Tizard. (Independent Press, 7s. 6d.)

The Cross, the Resurrection, and our Discipleship, by Douglas A. Griffiths. (The Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.)

Still They are Talking, by Leonard C. Horwood. (The Epworth Press, 5s.)

Why Did Christ Die?, by Herbert G. Wood. (The Epworth Press, 4s. 6d.)

The Beauty of Holiness, by J. Baines Atkinson. (The Epworth Press, 6s.)

Jesus, Leader of Men, by G. W. Butterworth. (Religious Education Press, 8s. 6d.)

The Notes and Tones of our Evangelism and other Studies, by Robert Ferguson. (The Epworth Press, 5s.)

Each of these eight books makes its contribution to the proclamation of the Truth. The fifteen *Sermons on the Parables of Jesus*, with their clear outlines and abundant illustrations, show the relevance of the parables today under such questions as 'Does God Care?', 'Why go to Church?', 'What can religion do for me?', 'Does God answer prayer?' Since 1949 Mr Crowe has shown his mettle in the annual Lenten devotional booklet *The Sanctuary*, which is used by half a million American families. *A More Excellent Way*, a powerful study of St Paul's 'Hymn to Love', was this year's Lenten Book for the Congregational Union, and presents a searching analysis of both the failures and possibilities of love in individual Christian experience. It challenges its readers and will move many to penitence and faith. *The Cross, The Resurrection, and Our Discipleship* contains the sermons for Palm Sunday, Good Friday, Easter Sunday and the following two Sundays, broadcast by the Rev. Douglas A. Griffiths. Many will remember the effect of these sermons when they were heard. The book has a like effectiveness. *Still They are Talking*, is a collection of eight sermons for the New Year, Good Friday, Easter Day, Whitsunday, Harvest Thanksgiving, Advent, Christmas and Watchnight. Dr Herbert G. Wood's twelve studies in *Why Did Christ Die?* were broadcast early in 1952. Their very brevity and simplicity tends to conceal the depth of thought and biblical knowledge behind them. They are an ideal basic study of the evangelical theme. 'To be saved, we need to be delivered from our self-centredness. No code of Law can do this. It requires . . . the "expulsive power of a great affection" for Christ'. 'His love for us, not our love for Him, is the basis of our hope and confidence.' Similarly, Mr Atkinson's *The Beauty of Holiness* offers an ideal starting-point for the study of what the Bible has to say about holiness. For a number of years Mr Atkinson has been lecturing to the students of Cliff College on this subject, and other Methodists will find no clearer guide to the biblical foundations for the doctrine of 'Christian Perfection'. In Dr Butterworth's *Jesus, Leader of Men*, a study of the Life of Jesus based mainly on the Synoptic Gospels, he attempts to see Jesus through the eyes of His contemporaries. Quite deliberately he excludes theological dogmas. Inevitably the limitation involved in such an approach create difficulties for the author—for instance under the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection and the miracles—but in an Epilogue, 'The Saviour of the World', Dr Butterworth adds the conclusions of convinced Christians. This careful and tenderly written guide to the life of Jesus is intended for teachers. The author's attitude is clearly expressed in his conclusions: 'To work out (doctrine) is a good work, and for some a necessary work. But a man can be a Christian without going far along that road. What he must not lack, however, is discipleship.' The most satisfying of all these books is Mr Ferguson's *The Notes and Tones of Our Evangelism*. Here are a hundred and twenty pages of delightful reading, packed with literary allusions and illustrations, the treasures of fifty years' thought and experience in the Ministry. What is more, here too are that depth of understanding, certainty of faith, winsome grace, and earnestness of purpose, which characterize the preacher's ideal. They shine through the skilful and sometimes delicately humorous writing.

RALPH KIRBY

From My New Shelf

BY C. RYDER SMITH

The Servant-Messiah, a Study of the Public Ministry of Jesus, by T. W. Manson. (Cambridge Press, 10s. 6d.). In this book of Lectures Prof. Manson wisely gives about a third of his space to the Jewish background in the days of Jesus. This leads up to the popular belief about the Messiah, illustrated chiefly from the Psalms of Solomon. Next there follows, under the title 'The Messianic Herald', an account of the Baptist's Messianic message. Here one may ask whether the contrast between John and Jesus' teaching is not best epitomized by putting together Luke 3:12-17 and 7:12-15, and did not Jesus declare that at long last He would be a Messiah of John's sort (e.g. Mt 13:11f.)? Two lectures deal with the 'principles' and 'practice' of Jesus' 'Messianic Ministry' and one with the Messiah on the Cross. Here the lecturer shows how Jesus' doctrine of the Messiah was 'subjected' to that of the Servant. A final lecture shows that ever since the Resurrection our Lord Himself has been 'leading' His disciples, who are His 'working body', by the same way as before. Dr Manson's well-known learning, insight and lucidity inform the whole book. Such a seasoned student of the Gospels as myself has found again and again that under his exposition there is 'still more light to break from the Word of God'. There are notable examples under the Feeding of the Five Thousand and the last chapter in Mark. Of course, Dr Manson sometimes takes sides. For instance, he thinks that the name 'Pharisee' was at first a nick-name, meaning 'Persian', and 'Sadducee' a Hebraism for the Greek *sundikos*; that the Woman with the Alabaster Box was, quite intentionally, 'anointing' the Messiah; and that the Triumphal Entry and the Cleansing of the Temple belong to the Feast of Tabernacles, six months before the final Passover. This book is *par excellence* 'a book not to miss'.

Studies in Biblical Theology (S.C.M.): *Studies in Deuteronomy*, by Gerhard von Rad' translated by David Stalker (7s.); *Early Christian Worship*, by Oscar Cullmann, translated by A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance (8s.). In the first book Prof. von Rad, starting and ending with the *Sitz im Leben* of Deuteronomy, discusses such subjects as its homiletical form, its use of the phrase 'I will put my name there', and its doctrine of 'the holy war'. Throughout he compares it with other documents. He thinks that the genealogy of its form runs from the distant amphictyony of Shechem through Joash to Josiah. Under the Books of Kings he maintains that the Deuteronomists found themselves obliged to include an un-Deuteronomic doctrine of the Davidic Kingship. This booklet does not pretend to cover the whole Deuteronomic problem, but each of the seven 'studies' is a real contribution to its discussion.

The second volume contains translations of two of Prof. Cullmann's brochures—one from German on 'Basic Characteristics of the Early Christian Service of Worship', and a longer one from French on 'The Gospel according to Saint John and Early Christian Worship'. Prof. Cullmann believes that the two Sacraments were the *only* distinctive Christian Services in the first century, a regular liturgy gradually forming around each rite. At the centre of both there was the belief in the presence of Christ, who had died and risen again, through and in the Spirit. The Service was Christian just because Christ was there. Prof. Cullmann believes too that the books of the New Testament being written for those who were used to these Services, there are allusions to the Sacraments in these books that the first Christians would catch at once, but that today's readers need to discover. In the first brochure he gathers and expounds these allusions in Acts and Paul; in the second he seeks to show that very much of the Fourth Gospel is just an exposition of the two Sacraments. Here his guiding principle is that for 'John' the stories that he tells were *both* 'past event in the historical life of Jesus' and 'liturgical event in

the community of the exalted Lord'. At times his exposition seems ingenious rather than convincing, and one wonders why he omits the story of Lazarus, but no one interested either in the current discussion of the Fourth Gospel or in the New Testament doctrine of the Sacraments, should miss this book.

The Fibres of Faith, by A. Norman Rowland (Independent Press, 10s. 6d.). In the three essays in this book the writer deals with two subjects—the seeming 'tension' between science and religion and the Hebraic background of Jesus' miracles. He seeks to open the door to faith that science seems to have shut. Under the first subject he shows that, if science takes the *whole* of experience as its subject—including, for example, personality and value and purpose as well as atoms and gases and so on—nature is hospitable to the belief in God. Under the second he shows from a long series of passages that in the Old Testament God's wonders in nature and His ways with men are not *two* doctrines of His *dunamis*, but *one*, and that this unity reaches its climax in the life and miracles of the Son of Man. Here he once or twice rather overstates the evidence—e.g. under the Miracle of the Loaves—but he makes his contention good. He believes that the Semitic mind of the first disciples enhanced the miracle stories in details, and suggests that Jesus was not 'equipped with special stores of knowledge and strength' that are not available to other men. To query this, however, does not invalidate Mr Rowland's argument. He makes many apt quotations but he is master of his own tools. His style is direct, lively, and occasionally pungent. He has a number of unusual but illuminating comments on particular texts, sometimes gathered from a sojourn in China. He talks to modern men in their own tongue. The many who fear that science has put a full stop to faith will find this a very helpful book.

Essential Christianity, by William E. Wilson (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.). Mr Wilson, rightly believing that Christianity is 'life' rather than 'dogma', urges that the Churches should jettison the latter. He allows that there is an irreducible minimum of Christian belief, but dislikes the formulation even of this. His own creed seems to run: 'I believe that Jesus showed us God as He really is; I believe that, since Christ's resurrection, men have been Christians through fellowship with Him; I believe that this fellowship shows itself in a life of love.' While Mr Wilson knows that some Churches impose no credal test upon their members, he thinks that even their attempts to state the implications of the Christian experience as the corollary of faith are just stumbling-blocks in the way both of the reunion of the Churches and of their work in the world. He claims that most of the New Testament is on his side, counting Paul the first misleader. He writes persuasively and in everyday language. Few will dispute his final message—'Christians, if you will just live like Christ, you will change the world at last'—but would the abolition of creeds remove the 'if'?

The Life of the Bible, by the late E. Sutherland Bates, revised and introduced by Charles F. Davey (Andre Deutsch, 8s. 6d.). This account of the story of the Bible, from the earliest Hebrew writings to today, was published in America in 1937. When Mr Davey undertook to prepare a British edition, he soon found that he needed to do more than remove passages of merely American interest—but he held his hand too soon. There are a good many misleading sentences and sheer errors—e.g. 'The essence of (the Prophets') political message was that the Hebrews must *look to themselves* for salvation'; '(The Deuteronomists) *rewrote the Hexateuch*'; 'All the Christian Sacred scriptures had actually been written *by the Jews*'; 'Dr Thomas Coke . . . laboured (*in the West Indies*) for nearly thirty years'; 'The first World Conference on *Faith and Order* was held in Edinburgh in 1910' (all italics mine). Further, to quote Mr Davey's own *caveat*, 'Dr Bates's point of view was that of a Christian liberal humanist'. He even wrote most of his first chapter on the theme 'the content of the Bible is Man'. Of course it is 'God and the Ways of God with men'. Yet the book is well laid out; it is written in a 'vigorous'

and attractive style; and the writer knew how to be interesting—e.g. by introducing 'juicy' details, such as 'the Great Hee Bible' and 'the Great She Bible'.

A Spiritual Journey with Paul, by Thomas S. Kepler (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via The Epworth Press, \$2.) Here are forty short articles written for a newspaper in Lent. Dr Kepler has eschewed such subjects as 'Justification' and 'Election', even though they meant so much to Paul in his 'spiritual journey', and there is no such emphasis as the Apostle's on Sin. No doubt the writer chose the subjects most likely to appeal to newspaper readers. Broadly speaking the articles follow the order of Paul's life. 'The Silent Years', 'Led by the Spirit', and 'I Press On', are specimen titles. Dr Kepler writes in up-to-date language, and he uses many up-to-date illustrations, most of them new. Within its chosen limits, his book is excellent.

OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

Discours chrétiens (Les Soucis des Paiens, Sentiments dans la Lutte des Souffrances, Les Pensées qui blessent dans le dos-pour edifier, discours pour la Communion du Vendredi) de Sören Kierkegaard. Praduction et introduction de P.-H. Tisseau (Belachaux et Niestlé, Neuchatel, francs suisses 6.50).

These our Prayers, the Prayer Life of Ordinary Men, by N. A. Turner-Smith (Independent Press, 5s.).

The Quest after Perfection and Popular Essays in Indian Philosophy, by M. Hiriyanna (Kavyalava Publishers, Mysore, 7s. 6d. each).

BOOKLETS AND PAMPHLETS

'Mrs Mish', The Confessions of a Missionary's Wife (The Epworth Press, 2s.). . . . *This Britain*, a sermon by W. E. Sangster (The Epworth Press, 3d.). . . . *All Children are Mine*, Margaret McMillon Lecture, by Arthur Greenwood (University of London Press, 1s. 6d.). . . . *The Psychology of Love in Forgiveness*, a Spiritual Healing booklet, by Ernest White (The Epworth Press, 1s.). . . . *The Spirit of God in the Synoptic Gospels*, a Re-Appraisal, by Irvin Wesley Batdorf (Princeton Pamphlet Series, New Jersey). . . . *African Opportunity*, by Lord Milverton (United Central Africa Association, 17 Old Bond St, W.1, 1s.). . . . *The Gospels Today*, by L. A. Garrard (Lindsey Press, 1s. 6d.). . . . *The Social Function of the University*, by Sir Hector Hetherington (Lindsey Press, 2s.). . . . *Breadth of Mind*, An aspect of Evangelical doctrine as received among the Methodists, by Edward Houghton (The Epworth Press, 1s. 6d.). . . . *Henry Jones, 1852-1922*, Centenary Addresses (one in English and one in Welsh), by Huw Morris-Jones and Hywel D. Lewis (University of Wales Press, Cardiff, 2s.). . . . *Scripture and Kindred Subjects*, an Annotated List of Books for Secondary-school Libraries (School Library Association, 28 Gordon Square, W.C.1, 2s. 6d.). . . . *Removing the Causes of War*, Swarthmore Lecture, by Kathleen Lonsdale (George Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.). . . . *Marriage and Divorce*, a Memorandum submitted to the Royal Commission, drawn up on behalf of 'The Alliance' (an Inter-Denominational Society for Education in Sex, Marriage and the Family) by Vincent Long (The Alliance, 112 City Road, E.C.2, 1s.). . . . *Cloud of Witnesses*, incorporating six historical scenes presented at the Festival of Congregationalism, by Eric Shave and Robert Duce (Independent Press, 1s.)

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

The Journal of Religion, January (University of Chicago, via Cambridge Press, \$1.75).

The Moment of Obligation in Experience, by Henry G. Bugbee, Jr.

Nonhuman Value, by Donald Walhout.

The Poetical Structure of Newman's *Apologia*, by Robert A. Colby.

The Expository Times, March (T. & T. Clark, 1s. 6d.)

The Christology of Leonard Hodgson's 'Doctrine of the Trinity', by Dennis Nineham.

Jesus' Own Thoughts about His Death, by R. W. Stewart.

do, April

Forsyth's 'Person and Place of Jesus Christ', by H. F. Lovell Cocks.

- The Excavation of Ras Sharmra, Past and Present (first part), by John Gray.
Listening to Sermons, by A. D. Harcus.
- do, May
- The Excavations of Ras Shamra (continued), by John Gray.
The Christological Theory of William Sanday, by D. M. Baillie.
'I' and 'We' in the Pauline Letters, by W. F. Lofthouse.
- The Hibbert Journal*, April (Allen and Unwin, 3s. 6d.)
- Can a Religious Philosophy be Scientific? (Intuitionism), by N. O. Lossky.
Is there a Metaphysic of History?, by Emile de Groot.
The Influence of Religion on the Progress of Medicine, by F. B. Julian.
In a Monastery (in *England Today*), by J. W. Rattray.
- The Congregational Quarterly*, April (Independent Press, 4s. 6d.)
- What may we Hope for in Society?, by John C. Bennett.
The 'Common Life' in the Reformed Tradition, by T. Ralph Morton.
The United Protestant Church in the Palatinate—the only Continental Independents, by Carl H. Schneider.
- Rylands' Library Bulletin*, March (Manchester University Press, 10s. 6d.)
- Galilee and the Galileans in St. Mark's Gospel, by G. H. Boobyer.
Browning: The Making of the Dramatic Lyric, by H. B. Charlton.
St Paul in Greece: The Letters to the Thessalonians, by T. W. Manson.
Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, by Sir Maurice Powicke.
- The International Review of Missions*, April (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.)
- The Light of History on Current Missionary Methods, by Kenneth S. Latourette.
Three articles on Christian Work in Arabian and other Muslim Lands, by Hendrik Kraemer, Kenneth Cragg, and E. F. F. Bishop.
- Missions of the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa, by H. T. Gonin.
The Place of the Bible—in Evangelism, by W. J. Platt, and in the Church, by C. E. Abraham.
- Theology Today*, April (Princeton, via B. H. Blackwell, Oxford, 5s.)
- An Estimate of the Revised Standard Version, by Gurdon C. Oxtoby.
What is Demythologizing? (a favourable view), by R. Gregor Smith.
The New Renaissance of Biblical Studies in the Roman Catholic Church, by Pius Parsch.
The Jehovah's Witnesses and Jesus Christ, by Bruce M. Metzger.
- The Harvard Theological Review*, January (Harvard Press, via Oxford Press, \$1.00).
- Augustine on the Creation of the World, by William A. Christian.
Some Early Medieval Commentaries on the Old Testament, by M. L. W. Laistner.
A Greco-Christian Inscription from Aila, by M. Schwabe.
- The Journal of Theological Studies*, April (Oxford Press, 18s. 0d.)
- Loaves and Thousands, by A. M. Farrer.
The Problem of Pseudonymity, by L. H. Brockington.
Notes on the Synoptic Problem, by B. C. Butler.
The Order of Q, by Vincent Taylor.
St John's Knowledge of Matthew, by P. Gardner-Smith.
The Primary Meaning of *Parakletos*, by J. G. Davies.
-

Our Contributors

- E. L. ALLEN**
PH.D., D.D.
Head of the Department of Divinity, King's College, Newcastle upon Tyne. Author of *The Structure of Life, Prophet and Nation Divine and Human*, etc.
- A. GARFIELD CURNOW**
Methodist Minister (retired). Formerly Superintendent of the Croydon Circuit. Honorary Chaplain to the Forces. Paton Prizeman (Church History) 1948. Awarded Langhorne-Orchard Essay Prize by Philosophical Society of Great Britain, 1952.
- TOM DRING**
Methodist Minister. College revealed a gift for Logic and Moral Philosophy. Ten years in Circuit work. Lent by Conference to British and Foreign Bible Society for twenty-eight years. Kept in touch with Philosophic thought and Scientific discovery throughout ministry. Regular contributor to the *Newcastle Press*, and book reviewer to the *Sunday Times*.
- CHRISTOPHER W. M. GELL**
B.A.
Educated at Wellington College (Scholar) and Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (Foundation Scholar in history). Contracted poliomyelitis 1945, was brought to England in an iron lung by hospital ship, and was invalided from the Indian Civil Service in 1947. Still almost completely paralysed and dependent on an iron lung at nights, now lives in South Africa for reasons of health. Read philosophy, began writing in 1950, and has contributed to British and South African periodicals on African and Asiatic affairs.
- T. FRANCIS GLASSON**
M.A., D.D.
Minister of Horley Methodist Church, Surrey. Author of *Thomas Glasson: Lay Preacher; The Second Advent: The Origin of the New Testament Doctrine*; and *His Appearing and His Kingdom*.
- ROBERT HAMILTON**
Author of books on Hilaire Belloc and W. H. Hudson. Contributor to *Quarterly Review*, *Nineteenth Century*, *Hibbert Journal*, *Horizon*, etc.
- J. A. LAINE**
M.A.
Circuit Steward of the Leicester South Circuit. Formerly Schoolmaster at Elizabeth College, Guernsey (1904-7); Rydal School, Colwyn Bay (1907-10); and Wyggeston Grammar School for Boys (1911-45).
- ATKINSON LEE**
M.A.
Scholar of Peterhouse, Cambridge Lecturer, Aberystwyth University College, 1903-8; Tutor, Hartley College, 1908-46. Lecturer in Psychology and Philosophy of Religion, Victoria University, Manchester, 1920-50. Author of *Sociality: the Art of Living Together*; and *Groundwork of the Philosophy of Religion*.
- E. GORDON RUFF**
M.A., B.D.
Methodist Minister. Lecturer in Modern Church History in the University of Cambridge, and the author of *Studies in the English Protestant Tradition*, and *Luther's Progress*.
- C. RYDER SMITH**
B.A., D.D.
Principal, Richmond College, 1929-40. Professor in Theology, London University, 1932-40. President, Wesleyan Methodist Conference, 1931. Author of many theological books.

Printed in Great Britain by Clements, Newling & Co. Ltd., Priory Works, Alperton, Wembley, Middx.,
and published by The Epworth Press (Frank H. Cumbers), 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1.
Price 4s. net per copy (postage, 3d.) or 15s. per annum, post free. Obtainable from all Booksellers.

